

VOLUME XLVIII • NUMBER 2

*April 1957*

# THE ROMANIC REVIEW

---

FOUNDED BY PROFESSOR HENRY ALFRED TODD

A QUARTERLY ISSUED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF  
ROMANCE LANGUAGES IN COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS • PUBLISHER



# THE ROMANIC REVIEW

## A QUARTERLY PUBLICATION

VOLUME XLVIII

APRIL 1957

NUMBER 2

JUSTIN O'BRIEN, *General Editor*

JEAN-ALBERT BÉDÉ	BERT M.-P. LEEFMANS
DINO BIGONGIARI	LAWTON P. G. PECKHAM
LEROY C. BREUNIG	MARIO A. PEI
ANGEL DEL RÍO	DANIEL F. PENHAM
ENRICO DE' NEGRI	JEANNE VARNEY PLEASANTS
OTIS FELLOWS	MICHAEL RIFFATERRE
DONALD M. FRAME	JAMES F. SHEARER
JEAN HYTIER	NORMAN L. TORREY

JULES BRODY, *Managing Editor*

---

## CONTENTS

### ARTICLES

Notes pour servir au commentaire du <i>Quart Livre</i>	EMILE V. TELLE	81
Le Brun's <i>Histoire d'Alexandre</i> and Racine's <i>Alexandre le Grand</i>	ROBERT W. HARTLE	90
Seven Letters of Paul Verlaine	ROBERT J. NIESS	104

### REVIEWS

David C. Cabeen, Editor, <i>A Critical Bibliography of French Literature</i> . Vol. II: <i>The Sixteenth Century</i> , edited by Alexander H. Schutz [DANIEL F. PENHAM]	118
Henri Weber, <i>La Crédation poétique au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle en France de Maurice Scève à Agrippa d'Aubigné</i> [ISIDORE SILVER]	122
Vicente Lloréns Castillo, <i>Liberales y románticos: Una emigración en Inglaterra (1823-1834)</i> [ÁNGEL DEL RÍO]	126
Leon Guichard, <i>La Musique et les lettres au temps du romantisme</i> and Thérèse Marix-Spire, <i>Les Romantiques et la musique: Le Cas George Sand, 1804-1838</i> [JEAN-ALBERT BÉDÉ]	132

## REVIEWS IN BRIEF

Walther Suchier, ed. <i>Adrian und Epictitus, nebst verwandten Texten (Joca Monachorum)</i> [W. T. H. JACKSON]	140
Angelo Poliziano, <i>Stanze cominciate per la giostra di Giuliano de' Medici</i> , ed. Vincenzo Pernicone [ALDO SCAGLIONE]	141
Paul O. Kristeller, <i>Studies in Renaissance Thought and Letters</i> [JOSEPH A. MAZZEO]	142
<i>Malherbe et son temps: IV<sup>e</sup> Centenaire de naissance (1555-1955). Etudes</i> [ARTHUR L. KURTH]	144
Lucien Jerphagnon, <i>Pascal et la souffrance</i> [J.-J. DEMOREST]	145
John Cairncross, <i>New Light on Molière. Tartuffe; Elmire hypocondre</i> [MORRIS BISHOP]	146
Katherine E. Wheatley, <i>Racine and English Classicism</i> [DONALD MAHER]	147
Paul Meister, <i>Charles Duclos (1704-1772)</i> [JOSEPH R. SMILEY]	148
Marie-Jeanne Durry, <i>Gérard de Nerval et le mythe</i> [A. RICHARD OLIVER]	149
Maurice Lecuyer, <i>Balzac et Rabelais</i> [STEPHEN GENDZIER]	150
Arnolds Grava, <i>L'Aspect métaphysique du mal dans l'œuvre littéraire de Charles Baudelaire et d'Edgar Allan Poe</i> [W. T. BANDY]	152
Robert Poulet, <i>La Lanterne magique</i> [JAMES C. McLAREN]	154
Jean Autret, <i>L'Influence de Ruskin sur la vie les idées et l'œuvre de Marcel Proust</i> [DOUGLAS W. ALDEN]	155
J. M. Cocking, <i>Proust</i> [JUSTIN O'BRIEN]	156
François Meyer, <i>L'Ontologie de Miguel de Unamuno</i> [A. SANCHEZ-BARBUJO]	157

THE ROMANIC REVIEW is published four times a year (February-April-October-December) by Columbia University Press, Mt. Royal and Guilford Aves., Baltimore 2, Md. Single copies \$1.25 (foreign \$1.35); \$5.00 a year (foreign, including Canada, \$5.30). Subscribers should notify the publisher of change of address at least three weeks before publication of issue with which change is to take effect. Entered as second-class matter, at the post office at Baltimore, Md., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Copyright 1957 by Columbia University Press.

Manuscripts, editorial communications, and books for review should be addressed to Professor Justin O'Brien, Philosophy Hall, Columbia University, New York City. THE REVIEW will not be responsible for the return of manuscripts unless accompanied by a self-addressed, stamped envelope. For all questions regarding preparation of manuscripts and printing style, consult the *MLA Style-Sheet* which originally appeared in *PMLA*, LXVI (1951), 3-31, and is available in reprints.

All communications of a business nature should be addressed to Columbia University Press, Mt. Royal and Guilford Aves., Baltimore 2, Md., or 2960 Broadway, New York 27, N. Y.

## NOTES POUR SERVIR AU COMMENTAIRE DU QUART LIVRE

Par Emile V. Telle

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

Ut enim nihil nugaçius quam seria nugatorie  
tractare, ita nihil festivius ita tractare  
nugas ut nihil minus quam nugatus fuisse  
videaris.

—Erasme à Thomas More, Préface de l'*Eloge de la Folie*

J'AI déjà signalé que la première édition du *Quart Livre* (Lyon, printemps 1548) pouvait passer, aux yeux du lecteur contemporain, pour un pamphlet antimonastique.<sup>1</sup> Ce point de vue paraît valable aussi pour l'édition définitive publiée par Rabelais un an avant sa mort. En voici le témoignage fourni par l'auteur lui-même.

### A. LE PROLOGUE DE 1548 ET L'EPITRE AU CARDINAL ODET DE CHATILLON, DE 1552<sup>2</sup>

1. *Le Prologue de 1548*: un ambassadeur dépêché par les lecteurs de Maître Alcofribas est venu féliciter Rabelais de son oeuvre. Pour le remercier, ces "gens de bien" lui ont fait cadeau d'un breviaire extraordinaire (ce dont il avait le moins besoin), à dire vrai, "plus que breviaire," probablement en forme de bouteille, suggère Plattard.<sup>3</sup> "Faict par invention mirifique" (l. 90), le relieur a utilisé le motif des crocs et des pies, pour signifier allégoriquement le sens de *croquer pie*. Au sens propre, l'expression signifie évidemment, déchirer la pie à belles dents. Au sens figuré, c'est boire. Mais ces pies, qui représentent-elles? Les moines vaincus par les "gays."<sup>4</sup> Donc, "*croquer pie*" veut dire faire la guerre aux moines et, de plus—ce qui va de soi—précher et pratiquer le pantagruélisme, c'est dire: *Boire*. En effet, que recommandent les inscriptions des réglets contenus dans ce breviaire? Boire du matin au soir! (ll. 92–95)

Ces gens de bien, "tous extraictz de bons peres et bonnes meres" (l. 118), nés en mariage légitime, bien "nez," et non fils bâtards de prêtres ou

1. "L'Ile des Alliances ou l'Anti-Thélème" dans *Mélanges Renaudet* (Genève: Droz, 1952), pp. 167–70, 174–75. Voir les réserves formulées par R. Marichal dans "L'Attitude de Rabelais devant le néoplatonisme," dans *François Rabelais: Ouvrage publié pour le quatrième centenaire de sa mort, 1553–1953* (Genève: Droz, 1953) p. 187 sq.

2. J'utilise l'édition Marichal (Genève: Droz, 1947).

3. Rabelais, *Oeuvres complètes*, V, 364, n. 21.

4. Au *Cinquième Livre*, chap. II, Rabelais s'est complu à donner toutes les déclinaisons possibles au mot "margaut," nom populaire de la pie. Cf. p. 311, n. 12. Il y a aussi jeu de mot sur "geay" ou "gay" (ceux qui savent rire). Rappelons l'interjection "guay, guay," utilisée par Frère Jean (*Gargantua*, chap. XL, fin). Cf. Erasme, "Epistola ad Gracculos" (1530), *Opus epistoliarum*, éd. Allen, VIII, 2275.

de moines, ont "dit" à l'auteur que tous ses livres leur plaisaient et notamment le dernier, le *Tiers Livre*, censuré par la Sorbonne, comme les deux premiers.

Ces gens de bien ont donc "adjudé" aux ennemis de Rabelais tous les vieux quartiers de lune, c'est-à-dire que les inquisiteurs de la Faculté de Théologie ont été déclarés par eux fous fieffés. Ces aliénés, le médecin les qualifie de certaines épithètes horribles qui firent dresser les cheveux sur la tête de l'ambassadeur: "caphards, cagotz, matagotz, botineurs, pape-lards, burgotz, patespelues, porteurs de rogatons, chattemites."<sup>5</sup> De qui s'agit-il ici? Evidemment des moines, espèce malfaisante qui n'a fait qu'emprunter et qui serait en voie de disparition en Europe. Ainsi le désirait ardemment l'ex-Franciscain qui, en cette matière, se plaisait à prendre ses souhaits pour des réalités accomplies: "Je presuppose que c'estoit [noter l'imparfait] quelque espece monstrueuse de animaulx barbares, ou temps des haultz bonnetz. Maintenant est deperie en nature, comme toutes choses sublunaires ont leur fin et periode, et ne sçavons quelle en soit la definition, comme vous sçavez que subject pery, facilement perit sa denomination" (ll. 132-37).

S'il restait un doute quant à l'identité de ces êtres inhumains, Rabelais l'ôte aussitôt: il insiste et précise que ce sont des diables, à savoir, au sens grec, des calomniateurs; non des diables d'enfer, à proprement parler, mais ses "appariteurs et ministres," donc ses pourvoyeurs, clairement annoncés par Saint Paul.<sup>6</sup> Mais, doublement hypocrites, "ces nouveaux diables engiponnez" (l. 168), à qui Alcofribas s'en prenait avec tant de haine dès *Pantagruel* (fin), ont "craché au bassin" pour accaparer à leur usage personnel et exclusif l'œuvre pantagruéline et ainsi "tollir es langoreux et malades le plaisir et passe temps joyeux, sans offense de Dieu, du roy ne d'autre" (ll. 206-07). Rabelais reprendra la même formule dans sa lettre à Odet de Châtillon.

Ces frénétiques, derniers survivants d'une engeance fatale, n'ont plus qu'une chose à faire: se détruire eux-mêmes. Rabelais leur fournira charitalement le licol et l'arbre. S'ils tardent, ils auront à se procurer eux-mêmes, et à leurs frais, les instruments de leur suicide, ou bien—et c'est moi qui ajoute ceci—qu'ils aillent "se faire pendre ailleurs." Où? Dans le Nouveau Monde.<sup>7</sup>

2. *L'Epitre liminaire à Odet de Châtillon:* Les deux premiers livres de *Pantagruel* ne sont dédiés à personne. Le *Tiers Livre* et l'édition définitive du *Quart Livre* sont placés sous l'égide de protecteurs influents. Sans doute, avaient-ils besoin de cette aide: les temps ont changé et Rabelais le sait mieux que quiconque. Marguerite de Navarre et le Cardinal de Châtillon

5. Cf. *Gargantua*, chap. XL, LIV; *Pantagruel*, chap. XXXVII.

6. I Tim., 4 et II Tim., 3.

7. V. *Mélanges Renaudet*, p. 168 et note 1.

furent, chacun à leur façon, favorables à la cause "évangélique," et à celle de Rabelais, qui sut, au cours de sa vie, s'assurer l'appui efficace des grands. Quatre ans après la publication du premier *Quart Livre*, l'auteur était pris entre deux feux: toujours en butte aux attaques de plus en plus violentes de ses vieux adversaires de droite, les Puy-Herbeault, étaient survenus les nouveaux ennemis de gauche, les enrages Calvinistes. Mais, à cette heure, les coups à craindre, surtout depuis la création de la Chambre Ardente et la mort de François I<sup>e</sup>, c'étaient évidemment ceux des orthodoxes, puisqu'ils pouvaient mener jusqu'au bûcher, en passant par "Procuration" (*Quart Livre*, chap. XII), "Condamnation," et "le Guichet" (*Cinquiesme Livre*, chap. XI). En fait, c'est à partir de 1543, et depuis la mort de Guillaume du Bellay, seigneur de Langey, pour être plus précis, que la moinerie ne laissa plus de répit à l'auteur du *Pantagruel*. Le départ de cette âme héroïque, le 10 janvier 1543, fut, s'il faut en croire son médecin, le signal des malheurs qui s'abattirent aussitôt sur la France (*Quart Livre*, chap. XXVI, ll. 40-45; chap. XXVII, ll. 63-67) et sur Rabelais: c'est de 1543, en effet, que daterait la condamnation de ses deux premiers livres. De 1543 à 1552, il aurait été assailli de toutes parts. En admettant qu'il joue un peu les martyrs, nous pouvons l'en croire sur parole. Le ton de sa lettre à Odet de Châtillon révèle un homme dont la patience est à bout, un homme traqué qui, désespéré, se jette dans le giron d'un cardinal qui n'avait d'écclésiastique que l'habit: "C'est la cause, Monseigneur, pourquoys praesentement, hors toute intimidation, je mectz la plume au vent, esperant que, par vostre benigne faveur, me serez [...] un second Hercules Gaullois, en sçavoir, prudence et eloquence" (ll. 150-54).

Jamais Alcofribas n'a laissé ainsi paraître son inquiétude. En vain, essaie-t-il d'affecter un ton pimpant "en mespris des choses fortuites": on comprend qu'il a couru et court encore des risques mortels: "Mais la calumnie de certains Canibales, misantropes, agelastes [les gens qui ne 'rigolent' pas, disons-nous, aujourd'hui], avoit tant contre moy esté atroce et desraisonnée qu'elle avoit *vaincu* ma patience, et plus n'estoys deliberé en escrire un iota. Car l'une des *moindres* [c'est moi qui souligne] contumelies dont ilz usoient estoit que telz livres tous estoient farciz d'heresies diverses" (ll. 103-08).

Sans les encouragements d'Odet de Châtillon, nous n'aurions donc ni le *Quart* ni le *Cinquiesme Livre*: "Car," affirme Rabelais, "par vostre exhortation tant honorable, m'avez donné et couraige et *invention*, et sans vous m'estoît le cœur failly [comparer au 'vaincu,' plus haut] et restoit *tarie* la fontaine de mes esprits animaux" (ll. 176-79). Le Cardinal aurait même indiqué dans quelle direction le conteur devait poursuivre le récit des aventures de Pantagruel: le sens antimonastique. C'était jeter de l'huile sur le feu. Rabelais le savait, et s'il reprenait la plume, c'est qu'il comptait sur l'appui de Châtillon et sur celui de la cour en général.

## B. LE "SENS" DES NAVIGATIONS DE PANTAGRUEL:

L'état d'âme de Rabelais, un Rabelais vieilli, au moment où il se mit à la rédaction des navigations de son héros, ne portait guère à la mise en œuvre du pantagruélisme. Pourtant, il fera effort pour dominer ses craintes et ses haines: la haute tenue philosophique du prologue de l'édition définitive, un des plus beaux passages dans l'œuvre du Maître, le montre. Il rhabillera son premier *Quart Livre*, le remaniera, le farcira de hors-d'œuvre propres à cacher l'anxiété qui s'était emparée de lui, en détachera certains chapitres qui serviront à confectionner le dernier livre posthume. Au fond, sous le vernis d'un style gai, et malgré les diversions auxquelles il soumettait à dessein le lecteur, on ne peut s'empêcher de découvrir une attitude belligérante non dissimulée, inconnue aux trois premiers livres, attitude maintenue tout au long du *Quart Livre* et reprise avec plus d'aigreur au *Cinquiesme*.

On remarquera en effet que toutes les îles découvertes par nos voyageurs dans la mer Océane sont désertes, incultes et sauvages. Et pourquoi? Parce que ces contrées ont été colonisées par les moines qui y ont été relégués après expulsion de leurs monastères de France. Or, l'on sait que cette race de gens passe son temps à ne rien faire fors "à gaudir, gazoiller et chanter" (*Cinquiesme Livre*, chap. VI) et à s'engraisser du travail des autres, et à "gaster" le reste. Telle était du moins la réputation des "diabiles engipponnez" auprès des disciples d'Erasme, dont étaient Rabelais aussi bien qu'Odé de Châtillon.<sup>8</sup>

Font exception à ce trait commun à toutes les Terres Neuves, les îles de Médamothi ("nul lieu," chap. II, éd. de 1552), de Cheli (chap. V, éd. de 1548; chap. X, éd. de 1552), de Gaster (chap. LVII, éd. de 1552), et des Papimanes (chap. XLVIII, éd. de 1552). La raison? Variété dans les escales et souci de ne pas souligner trop crûment l'intention du livre, tout en le faisant quand même à la barbe des censeurs. Le chapitre des Ennasins, par exemple, permettait d'aborder dans une île peuplée certes, mais cette population désœuvrée ne passe son temps qu'à faire alliance en vue de produire des bâtards. D'ailleurs, les îles *apparemment* prospères ne doivent cet aspect trompeur qu'aux largesses folles des gens "de l'autre monde." Tel passage du chapitre VI du *Cinquiesme Livre* met clairement les points sur les i.<sup>9</sup>

"Procuration," où vivent les "museaux rouges," sergents des officialités (généralement des moines, qui n'ont pas entrée à Thélème) "est un pays tout chaffouré et barbouillé" (chap. XII, éd. de 1552; chap. VI, éd. de 1548).

8. Il avait été élevé par l'humaniste érasmien, ami de Berquin, Nicolas Béault. V. Allen, *Opus epistolarum Erasmi*, III, 925 (introd.).

9. "De quel pays vous vient ceste corne d'abondance, et copie de tant de biens et frians morceaux?"

— De tout l'autre monde [...]—De Touraine [...] qui, d'après Rabelais, s'est ruinée à engrasser ces méchants oiseaux (éd. Plattard, V, 22). Le podestat d'Ennassin parlant aux navigateurs les considère avec mépris comme gens "de l'autre monde."

Les navigateurs n'y sont invités ni à boire ni à manger, ce qui est leur préoccupation immédiate dès qu'ils mettent pied à terre; car sans nourritures terrestres, comment être à même de prier Dieu convenablement?

Thohu (déserte) et Bohu (inculte) (chap. VII, éd. de 1548; chap. XVII, éd. de 1552)—contrepartie de Cheli—sont si désolées qu'elles n'ont même plus de batteries de cuisine. Faute de nourriture, le géant Bringuenarilles (naseaux fendus: mal "nez") les avala et il en mourut.

L'île des Macraeons (le dernier chapitre [XI] tronqué de l'édition de 1548 se terminant sur cette phrase: "Vray est que quia plus nen dict" [chap. XXV de l'édition de 1552]) semble bien pourvue en vivres, mais "seulement estoit habitée en trois portz et dix paroeces: le reste estoit boys de haulte fustaye et desert, comme si feust la forest de Ardeine."

L'île de Tapinois, où régne Quaresme Prenant, un bien triste "gonfalonier des Ichthyophages" qui "jamais ne se trouve aux nöpcses," n'a pour tout mets qu'"aubers salliez, casquetz, morrions salles et salades sallées."

L'île Farouche (appelée ainsi par antiphrase), habitée d'Andouilles peu amènes, puisqu'elles font la guerre à Pantagruel, est l'antithèse de Tapinois. Là règne la reine Niphleseth (membre viril) qui finit par se marier "dont loué soit Dieu." Les Andouilles représentent peut-être les nonnes.

Dans l'île de Ruach, on ne vit que de vent ou de fumée (Ruach: "vent ou esprit" dit la *Briefve Declaration*, ou Rauch?)

L'île des Papefigues (ceux qui ont osé se moquer du Pape: peut-être les Franciscains conventuels), autrefois riche et puissante, est maintenant pauvre et assujettie aux Papimanes (les Franciscains de la stricte Observance?)

A partir de ce chapitre, commence la propagande contre la politique financière de la papauté, à proprement parler la seconde partie et le dernier développement du *Quart Livre*. L'antiromisme gallican n'est d'ailleurs nullement éloigné de l'antimonachisme: il en coule de source pour les gens de l'époque, parce que les moines passaient (bien qu'ils eussent la réputation d'intimider la papauté, avec qui on les accusait d'avoir partie liée) pour les agents les plus zélés et les plus redoutables de la Curie. Bien entendu, ils étaient aussi responsables des excès et des exactions de Rome, aux dires des monachophobes.

Après Gaster, d'intérêt tout spécial pour ceux qui sont toujours en cuisine (ce chapitre fait pendant à celui de l'Île de Cheli où trône saint Panigon), nous touchons aux dernières escales: d'abord "pres" de l'île de Chaneph (*Hypocrisie*), vraie réplique de l'île des Alliances: hormis que les habitants sont des ermites et aussi des ermitesses. Eux aussi, sans connaître le mariage légitime, et sans être vierges ni mariés, perpétuent leur lignée.

De loin, on découvre l'île de Ganabin, habitée par des voleurs, des écumeurs de mer.

De cet itinéraire, on peut déduire que Rabelais—exhorté dans ce sens par Odet de Châtillon—visait à se venger des moines en proposant qu'on les

déportât outre-mer: vraisemblablement, l'idée fut prise au sérieux dans les cercles érasmiants. Ainsi, il exerçait une double vengeance: 1) en débarrassant la France de ses "ventres" insatiables; 2) en les accusant de continuer à "tout gaster" dans le Nouveau Monde. Ils demeuraient les mêmes ennemis de toute société civilisée par leur fainéantise, leur malice, leur fausse religion et ce goût des excès qui les faisaient tomber dans des pratiques ascétiques et des concepts "misosophiques," hostiles à l'humanité physique et spirituelle de l'homme; en bref, où qu'ils fussent, c'étaient de mauvais hommes, de mauvais citoyens, de mauvais chrétiens: "[...] aussi depuis trois cents ans, ne sçay comment, entre ces joyeux oyseaulx, estoit par chascune quinte lune avolé grand nombre de Cagotz, lesquels avoient honny et conchié toute l'Isle, tant hideux et monstrueux que de tous estoient reffuis."<sup>10</sup>

#### C. RABELAIS ET FLAVIUS JOSÈPHE

Rabelais, qui aime tant citer ses auteurs, a jugé à propos de ne pas nommer l'historien juif Flavius Josèphe, un des classiques les plus populaires auprès des réformateurs. Or, l'ex-Franciscain s'est libéralement inspiré des chapitres des *Antiquités des Juifs* (Livre XVIII, chap. 1) et de la *Guerre des Juifs* (Livre II, chap. 8) dans lesquels il est question des Essènes. On sait maintenant pourquoi.<sup>11</sup>

Depuis cinquante ans, à la date de 1550, les humanistes se plaisaient à chercher dans le mosaïsme les "antiquités" du monachisme dans le dessein de prouver que les "sectes" étaient pires que leur prototype judaïque: Josèphe tombait à point. Maître Alcofribas n'innovait donc pas, mais à l'instar d'Érasme, il avait su donner allure nouvelle et plus mordante encore à cette peu flatteuse comparaison, déjà si usée, en ne relevant qu'un trait de mœurs des nouveaux Essènes: leur mépris du septième sacrement qu'ils ne fuyaient très légalement qu'à cause et en raison même d'affinités spirituelles soigneusement cultivées par eux. En outre, il avait omis tout ce qui dans Josèphe était éloge décerné à la plus stricte et aussi la plus admirable des sectes juives.

Or, le chapitre des Alliances n'est pas le seul où Rabelais ait mis l'historien juif à contribution. Le chapitre de l'Isle des Macraeons, sur lequel se termine brusquement l'édition dite partielle (c'est le chap. XXV de l'éd. de 1552), en provient aussi directement. C'est la suite naturelle à l'épisode des Allianciers: "Vray est que qui a [faut-il lire en deux mots, et non en un, comme le font, en suivant le texte imprimé Plattard et Marichal] plus, n'en dict." Ce qui veut dire: je m'arrêterai ici, bien que j'aie matière pour continuer. En effet, le conteur, puisant toujours dans Josèphe, a fait de l'ile des Ennasés, proprement dits, l'ile des Essènes *jeunes* et l'ile des Macra-

10. *Cinquième Livre*, chap. II, éd. Plattard, p. 13. Rabelais rappelle ici l'aversion éprouvée par les séculiers pour les réguliers.

11. V. *Mélanges Renaudet*, p. 161-64.

eons serait alors celle des *vieux* Essènes centenaires. Ainsi, séparés par la mer, les Macrobes n'ont plus aucun contact avec leurs jeunes condisciples: l'historien dit en effet que les Anciens croyaient nécessaire de se laver dès qu'ils avaient été touchés par les impurs (*Guerre des Juifs*, II, 8, 10). Non que le conteur éprouvât plus de respect pour les Macrobes que pour autres microbes, adeptes de l'ascétisme professionnellement misogame, car il se hâte de faire dériver le mot macrobe (par Panurge, il est vrai) de maquerelle: "[...] aux jeunes [Allianciers] compete culletaige"; "[...] maquerellaige ne compete que aux vieilles." Cette même idée (Rabelais et son siècle sont inlassables quand il s'agit de défendre la philogamie "évangélique") est reprise plus loin, nous l'avons vu, dans le passage de l'île de Chaneph où vivent aussi des "macrobes" ermites, très vraisemblablement des Chartreux.

Une phrase du paragraphe suivant de ce même chapitre de la *Guerre des Juifs* a suffi pour permettre à Rabelais d'inventer le chapitre XXVI et de donner prétexte aux deux suivants: "Comme les fils de la Grèce, ils croient aussi que les belles âmes ont leur habitation au delà de l'Océan, dans une région qui n'est troublée ni par les tempêtes de pluie ni par les rafales de neige, ni par la chaleur excessive, mais constamment caressée par zéphyr. Tandis qu'ils relèguent les âmes indignes dans une antre sombre, froide et agitée des éléments, où elles sont soumises à une punition sans fin."

Le vieil Essène s'imagine naïvement que la tempête, que vient d'essuyer la flottille pantagruéline, est due au décès de quelque Macrobe. Or, nous lecteurs, savons bien que c'est la rencontre fortuite de toutes ces orques chargées de moines lanterniers qui a déchaîné les éléments. Une âme de moine "moiné" ne peut être belle! Qu'à cela ne tienne! C'est une occasion pour Rabelais de faire sa cour aux Du Bellay en rappelant le trépas du Seigneur de Langey si dommageable pour la France et pour l'auteur du *Pantagruel*, et de poursuivre par le chapitre XXVIII pour arriver en Tapisois. Ainsi, cinq chapitres du *Quart Livre* définitif (IX, XXV-XXVIII) dérivent de quelques lignes de la *Guerre des Juifs* (II, 8): notable trait d'invention chez Rabelais qui méritait d'être mis en lumière.

En outre, l'épisode des paroles qui dégénèrent peut se rattacher au passage de Josèphe cité plus haut: les voyageurs seraient arrivés dans les parages où reposent les belles âmes esséniennes. Au doux vent d'ouest et "advenente la serenité et temperie du bon temps" (chap. LVI) les mots de "gueule" se mettent à fondre.

#### D. LE PROLOGUE DE 1552

Du prologue de 1552 se dégage un enseignement plein de modération épicienne qui tranche sur le souhait non "médiocre" exprimé tout au long du *Quart Livre*: celui de voir la France purgée de toute la gent monastique.

D'après ce prologue, il ne faut rien désirer pour nous-mêmes qui ne soit

conforme à notre nature physiologique ou qui puisse lui nuire. Guerre aux excès et aux enthousiasmes débridés; guerre à l'ascétisme sous toutes ses formes, physiques et métaphysiques: "Sans point de faute, s'écrie Panurge transporté d'euphorie, nous doibvons bien louer le bon Dieu nostre createur, servateur, conservateur, qui par ce bon pain, par ce bon vin et frays, par ces bonnes viandes nous guerist de telles perturbations, tant du corps comme de l'ame, oultre le plaisir et volupté que nous avons beuvans et mangeans" (chap. LXV, ll. 30-38).

D'où: cultivons la Médiocrité. "Qui potest capere . . . capiet." et non "capiat," aurait écrit Rabelais. Laissons de côté les farcissures de ce morceau de choix—elles n'en sont pas le moindre charme—vrai hymne d'eudémonisme hippocratique. La leçon sera la suivante: 1) "Sans santé n'est la vie que langueur; la vie n'est que simulacre de mort" (ll. 78-79. Avis aux Chartreux!) 2) Il ne faut rien souhaiter qui dépasse nos limites (guerre aux vœux—souhaits—monastiques) et qui ne convienne à chaque individu pris séparément. Idée de Thélème. "Non omnibus congruunt omnia" n'avait cessé de répéter Erasme.

Cette doctrine, c'est la quintessence de la *Philosophia Christi*, telle qu'on la trouve exprimée dans toute l'œuvre du père spirituel de Rabelais, notamment dans l'*Enchiridion*, (canons IV et V), l'*Eloge du mariage* (1518), la lettre à Christophe de Utenheim, évêque de Bâle, sur l'usage des Viandes (*De esu carnium*, 1522). Mais cette ordonnance de thérapeutique personnelle s'étendait de force à l'action sociale. Faut-il donc conclure du contraste évident entre le sens profond du *Quart Livre* et le Prologue de 1552 que Rabelais se doutait bien que la chirurgie sociale par lui proposée—expulsion immédiate des "caphards empatoufflez"—ne serait opération aisée à réaliser? Bien sûr. D'où, deuxième leçon, et celle-ci encore parfaitement érasmienne: attentisme et réforme aristocratique, *par le haut, pour commencer*. Laissons faire le temps qui travaille pour nous en hauts lieux. "Attendez encores un peu avecques demie once de patience" (ll. 498-99).

Ainsi, la question religieuse qui continuait à hanter l'ancien Franciscain, c'était encore et toujours, à la veille de la mort, la question du monachisme. Faute de l'avoir compris, les commentateurs des deux derniers livres de Rabelais ont fait fausse route dans leurs interprétations et notamment dans celles du *Quart Livre* qui passe encore pour énigmatique. Ce n'est pas un livre, ou plutôt, ce n'est pas qu'un livre de "folastries joyeuses" où l'auteur, sans but arrêté sinon celui de l'oracle de Bacbuc, aurait donné toute bride à une fantaisie désordonnée en promenant au hasard et au gré des vents ("je mectz la plume au vent" disait-il à Châtillon) un lecteur béat et la flotte pantagruéline d'île désolée en île déserte. Fantaisie bien monotone et indigne d'un penseur et d'un artiste tel que le Tourangeau. Le rêve éveillé, les enjolivures livresques, les hors-d'œuvre inattendus, et à perte de vue, ont certes leur part, trop grande (à notre goût) dans l'épopée rabelaisienne, mais il ne faut pas oublier que le désordre est chez

le Maître l'apprêt d'une ordonnance savamment élaborée, un conditionnement voulu par un auteur opiniâtre qui tenait, grâce à ce camouflage, à faire passer la pilule sans trop courir les risques de poursuites inquisitoriales, fatales au médecin.

Il s'agissait non de parler pour ne rien dire, mais de persister à *dire* tout en n'ayant pas l'air "d'y toucher." Et ici encore, c'est d'érasmisme qu'il s'agit: "Non est constantia semper eadem loqui, sed semper *eodem* pertendere."<sup>12</sup>

12. *Spongia*, éd. Leclerc, Leyde, XI, 1663 F.

## LE BRUN'S *HISTOIRE D'ALEXANDRE* AND RACINE'S *ALEXANDRE LE GRAND*

By Robert W. Hartle

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

THE series of Gobelins tapestries which represents outstanding events from the life of Alexander the Great was the best known series done by the Gobelins in the seventeenth century.<sup>1</sup> The series consisted of five main scenes, evenly divided between those which showed Alexander's magnanimity and those which showed his prowess in battle: *The Crossing of the Granicus*, *The Battle of Arbela*, *The Family of Darius*, *The Porus Presentation Scene* (half battle and half magnanimity) and *The Triumphal Entry into Babylon*. They stand fifteen and three-quarters feet high (4 m. 80) and are somewhat more than twenty feet long. To these are added an *Aile gauche* and an *Aile droite* for each of the battles—of the same height but only one-third as long—and in some of the series one *Entre-fenêtre*, thus making a total of eleven or twelve large hangings. During the seventeenth century this series was produced at the Gobelins alone eight times, four times on high-warp looms and four times on low-warp looms; all but once gold thread was interwoven into the cloth.<sup>2</sup> In the 1670's some of the best engravers were set to making copies of the series.<sup>3</sup> These engravings enjoyed a very wide dissemination, and the *ateliers* in Brussels, Aubusson and Felletin used them as models to produce their own sets of tapestries (Göbel, loc. cit.). Perhaps because the features of Alexander bore a certain idealized resemblance to his own, this series was a great favorite with Louis XIV: he gave copies of it to the Duc de Lorraine, to his brother, the Duc d'Orléans, to a minister of the King of Denmark and to Mlle de Montpensier (Fenaille, loc. cit.). Furthermore, one of the four paintings in the *Chambre du Roi* at Versailles represented "Porus, Roy des Indes, qui est présenté tout couvert de blessures à Alexandre."<sup>4</sup> And, finally, Racine wrote a play entitled *Alexandre le Grand* and dedicated it to the King.

1. Heinrich Göbel, *Wandteppiche*, II. Teil: *Die romanischen Länder* (Leipzig, 1928), I, 132.

2. Maurice Fenaille, *Etat général des tapisseries de la Manufacture des Gobelins, depuis son origine jusqu'à nos jours* (Paris, 1903), II, 184-85.

3. Jules Guiffrey, ed., *Comptes des Bâtiments du Roi sous le règne de Louis XIV*. I: *Colbert, 1664-1680* (Paris, 1881), cols. 474, 543, 544, 709, 927, 994, 1088.

4. [Laurent Morellet] le sieur Combes, *Explication historique de ce qu'il y a de plus remarquable dans la maison royale de Versailles et en celle de Monsieur à Saint Cloud* (Paris, 1681), p. 43. Further evidence of the vogue of Alexander may be found in Jean François Félibien's *Entretiens sur les vies et sur les ouvrages des plus excellens peintres, anciens et modernes*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1685), I, 284, where he relates that in the antechamber of the King's apartment in the Louvre there are the busts of the twelve Caesars, "& plusieurs autres figures d'une singulière beauté. Mais entre tous ces riches monumens de l'Antiquité, il y a une teste d'Alexandre d'un travail admirable." It is interesting for this study that the first edition of this work was published in 1666 (Quérard), the year Racine's play was published with its Dedication to the King.

One would suppose that the history of a series of works at once so popular and also the object of such signal royal favor would be well documented and accurately dated. Unfortunately, however, this is far from being the case. Writers on the subject often fail to keep separate the series of paintings—which Le Brun began with no thought of using as tapestry models<sup>5</sup>—from the series of tapestries themselves. Besides that, book-keeping in the seventeenth century was frightfully haphazard, being tantalizingly complete in some respects and very casual in other. One can, for instance, find out exactly how many moles were killed in the royal gardens each year from 1664 to 1680, but in only one year, 1668, does Colbert's accountant bother to name the subject matter of tapestries being paid for.<sup>6</sup> The *Inventaire général du mobilier de la couronne, de 1663 à 1715* gives only the yardage of the tapestries turned over to the Crown, but again does not mention the subject matter, nor were the entries always made on time (Gerspach, p. 5). The conjectures for the painting of the first picture, which represents the clemency of Alexander towards the family of Darius, *La Tente de Darius*, range between 1660 and 1662.<sup>7</sup> The dates given for the beginning and ending of the first complete set of tapestries range from around 1660 to 1680.<sup>8</sup> The outside limit for the last painting is usually given as 1668.<sup>9</sup> These conjectures are ordinarily couched in the form of a dogmatic statement of fact with no indication given as to the source of information. Bénézit, for example, states that Mazarin invited Le Brun to Fontainebleau, where he painted the *Tente de Darius*, and that the King was so pleased that he gave Le Brun his portrait in a frame set with diamonds, plus a pension of 12,000 *livres* (*Dictionnaire*, loc. cit.). The sources of this story are somewhat confused,<sup>10</sup> but we do know that Le Brun was in charge of painting and tapestry-making for Fouquet at Vaux and the nearby village of Maincy until the *Surintendant* was arrested on September 5, 1661.<sup>11</sup> It would have

5. E. Gerspach, *Répertoire détaillé des tapisseries des Gobelins exécutées de 1662 à 1892* (Paris, 1893), p. 77.

6. Guiffrey cites many examples of shocking inexactitude (*Comptes*, pp. xiv ff.). Smaller examples abound, such as payments in 1679 to the heirs of the painters Quillerier and Nocret for work done between 1666 and 1671 (*ibid.*, cols. 1123-24).

7. Henry Jouin, *Charles Le Brun et les arts sous Louis XIV* (Paris, 1889), gives 1660 in one place (pp. 133-34), but in another place speaks of "les Reines de Perse ou la *Tente de Darius*, exécutées en 1661" (p. 221, n. 1). The following also use 1660: Gaston Brière, *Catalogue des peintures exposées dans les galeries du musée du Louvre* (Paris, 1924), I, 155, and E. Bénézit, *Dictionnaire des peintres, sculpteurs, dessinateurs et graveurs*, nouv. éd. (Paris, 1952), V, 460. For the 1662 dating see Ulrich Thieme and Felix Becker, *Allgemeine Lexikon der bildenden Künstler von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart* (Leipzig, 1907), XXII, 510.

8. To account for a supposedly missing fifth high-warp series, Gerspach suggests that it must have been done at Maincy, hence before September 1661 (*Répertoire*, p. 77). Fenaille (II, 184) and Göbel (loc. cit.) postulate the dates 1664 to 1680 for the weaving of the first high-warp series.

9. Jouin states "vers 1668" (p. 212) and he is followed by Brière and Thieme and Becker.

10. Cf. Jouin, *Charles Le Brun*, p. 213 and n. 2, for an account of such a portrait which may have been given to Le Brun in 1667.

11. Gerspach, pp. 12, et passim; René Crozet, *La Vie artistique en France au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle (1598-1661): Les Ariistes et la société* (Paris, 1954), pp. 106, et passim; J. Loret, *Le Musée historique, ou Recueil des lettres en vers (1650-1665)*, nouv. éd., ed. Ch.-L. Livet (Paris, 1878), III, 393.

been rather strange for him to be working for Fouquet at 12,000 *livres* while drawing 12,000 *livres* from the King as his *Premier Peintre*. Cardinal Mazarin died March 9, 1661.

Given the central importance of the History of Alexander in the cultural life of the time, it should be of service to attempt to narrow down these dates of composition, despite the difficulty involved on account of faulty and incomplete records. In fact, a careful re-telling of the circumstances of composition may well be helpful not only to art history but also to literary history, if we can describe the status of these works during the period when Racine was thinking about, and working on, his *Alexandre le Grand*.<sup>12</sup> In attempting this reconstruction we shall proceed by indirection and conjecture, always, however, citing our sources fully, so that anyone who follows with more complete information may pick up where we leave off, knowing what to keep and what to reject.

The disturbing thing about the date 1660 for the first painting is that it is proposed by Pellisson in his *Mémoires sur les membres de l'Académie de Peinture*.<sup>13</sup> Inasmuch as he, too, was an employee of Fouquet and spent five years in the Bastille for defending him, one would not expect him to make a mistake about the date. There is, however, another contemporary reference which seems even more reliable: on July 31, 1671 and January 3, 1672, Gérard Edelinck was paid a total of 800 *livres* on engravings from Le Brun's *Histoire d'Alexandre* (Guiffrey, *Comptes*, col. 544). At the bottom of the engraving of the *Tente de Darius* (reproduced by Fenaille, II, 166) we read: "Gravé par le Sr. Edelinck, d'après le tableau qu'en a faict Mr. Le Brun premier peintre du Roy et que sa Ma<sup>te</sup> prenoit plaisir de luy voir peindre à fontainebleau en l'année 1661." This evidence, which is much closer in time of composition than Pellisson's *Mémoires*, and which was produced under the supervision of the *Premier Peintre* himself, seems conclusive when added to the known date of Fouquet's arrest. It is the one used by Fenaille, Göbel and others.

12. Racine finished *La Thébaïde* in December 1663 (*Oeuvres de J. Racine*, ed. Paul Mesnard, [Paris, 1865], I, 60). If we accept the suspiciously pat letter of Pomponne, Racine had written three and one-half acts of *Alexandre* by February 1665. M. Antoine Adam makes a good case for the necessity of accepting the letter (*Histoire de la littérature française au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle* [Paris, 1954], IV, 289, n. 2; but see also Raymond Picard, *La Carrière de Jean Racine* [Paris, 1956], p. 193). It is strange how few literary historians and critics have mentioned Le Brun's tapestries in connection with Racine's play: Georges Le Bidois, *La Vie dans la tragédie de Racine* (Paris, 1901), p. 5; Raymond Picard, ed., Racine, *Oeuvres complètes* (Paris, 1951), p. 1093; Antoine Adam, IV, 336. All these writers mention merely as a curiosity the fact that the works are contemporaneous. The only person, to the best of my knowledge, to suggest that there might be a causal relation between the two works is Georges May, *Tragédie cornélienne, tragédie raciniennne: Etude sur les sources de l'intérêt dramatique*, Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, XXXII, No. 4 (Urbana, 1948), pp. 139-40. M. May tentatively accepts the dates 1662 to 1668 for the paintings and a hypothetical date of 1666 for *Alexandre et Porus*. He concludes: "Si l'idée de célébrer Alexandre vint donc à Le Brun avant de venir à Racine, l'idée de l'épisode particulier d'Alexandre et de Porus semble en revanche être venue d'abord à Racine et il n'est pas impossible que le succès de sa tragédie ait fourni au peintre le sujet de sa quatrième toile des *Batailles d'Alexandre*."

13. I, 24 ff., as cited by Jouin, p. 133.

Tradition has it that the King followed closely the progress of the picture, visiting Le Brun every day (Jouin, p. 134). Félibien, who received a pension for his official descriptions of the royal art treasures, wrote somewhat hyperbolically that "ce rare Ouvrage que son excellent Auteur vient d'achever, est moins une production de son art & de sa science, qu'un effet des belles idées qu'il a reçues de V. M. quand elle luy a commandé de travailler pour Elle."<sup>14</sup> When the picture was hung in the Royal *Cabinet des peintures* the King is said to have remarked that "il conservoit au milieu de tant de rares Tableaux, un éclat & une force que rien n'estoit capable d'effacer" (*ibid.*, p. 52).

The King was pleased, and named Le Brun *Premier Peintre*, which gave him a virtual dictatorship over all works of art produced for the Royal household. Now, the King's predilection for this particular painting was perhaps only one of a combination of circumstances favorable to Le Brun, which included the double protection of Colbert and Chancellor Séguier.<sup>15</sup> The repairs needed after the great fire in the Louvre of February 6, 1661, required a master decorator who could co-ordinate work which had been given out piecemeal (Guiffrey, *Comptes*, *passim*). There can be no doubt that while at Vaux in mid-August 1661, the King was impressed by Le Brun's organizational ability and decided simply and directly that he must have that man, just as when he later remembered Fouquet's orange trees and had them transported from Vaux to the Tuilleries and Versailles (*ibid.*, col. 102, n. 1).

Perhaps, then, the King was very strongly predisposed to like the picture even before it was painted. But, of course, Le Brun had no way of knowing that, and it must have been quite a difficult problem for him to resolve, if the legend is correct that it was Louis himself who proposed to Le Brun that he paint something from the life of Alexander. Working in the allegorical tradition of his time he had to represent in the painting some facet of Louis' life. How could he do this for a king who had been living at peace since the Treaty of the Pyrenees in 1659? One can imagine Le Brun hastily leafing through Amyot's *Plutarque*, until he came upon the description of Alexander's treatment of Darius's family, where, after speaking of the women's beauty, he says, "Mais Alexandre estimant, à mon avis, estre chose plus royale, se vaincre soy mesme, que surmonter ses ennemis, ne les toucha ny elles, ny austres fille ou femme, avant que les espouser" (*Alexandre le Grand*, XXXIX). These words are directly echoed in the inscription on Edelinck's engraving: "Il est d'un Roy de se vaincre soy mesme."<sup>16</sup>

14. *Les Reines de Perse aux pieds d'Alexandre: Peinture du Cabinet du Roy*, in *Recueil de Descriptions de peintures et d'autres ouvrages faits pour le Roy* (Paris, 1689), pp. 28-29. *Les Reines de Perse* was first published separately in 1663 (*Cat. de la Bibl. Nat.*).

15. There was the happy coincidence that Le Brun had recently painted the famous painting of Séguier as he took part in the procession upon the entry of the King and Queen into Paris in 1660 (Crozet, p. 104).

16. Fenaille, II, 166. Cf. Félibien, *Les Reines de Perse*: "Le Peintre ne pouvoit exposer aux

On the other hand, perhaps the King himself suggested the scene and the moral to be drawn from it. Certainly he had a flair for dramatizing his own magnanimity and self-control (e.g., the famous episode with the Duc de Lauzun where he threw his cane out the window rather than have it said that he had struck a *gentilhomme*). In his *Mémoires* he reflected, "Mais à qui se peut vaincre soi-même, il est peu de chose qui puisse résister."<sup>17</sup> Whether the suggestion came from the King or was his own find, the fact that he had found a touchstone for flattering the King was not lost upon Le Brun. On the tapestry made from this painting Le Brun placed the motto: "SUI VICTORIA INDICAT REGEM." In the remaining tapestries Le Brun repeatedly used the word *virtus* somewhat ambiguously:<sup>18</sup>

*La Bataille au Passage du Granique*

VIRTUS OMNI OBICE MAIOR

*La Bataille d'Arbelles*

DIGNA ORBIS IMPERIO VIRTUS

*Porus blessé est amené devant Alexandre*

SIC VIRTUS ET VICTA PLACET

*Le Triomphe d'Alexandre*

SIC VIRTUS EVEHIT ARDEN

La vertu surmonte tout obstacle.

La vertu est digne de l'empire du monde.

La vertu plaît quoique vaincue.

Ainsi par la vertu s'élèvent les héros.<sup>19</sup>

In other words it was Alexander's *virtus-vertu* that made him a great man, rather than his military prowess. Later on, Le Brun returned to the theme of Louis' self-control in more direct fashion on the tapestry representing *Air* in the series of the *Four Elements*: "LUDOVICUS XIII HOSTIUM SUIQUE IPSIUS VICTOR" (Félibien, *Recueil*, p. 119).

The first really solid piece of documentation on the Gobelins tapestries is the *acte* by which the Hôtel des Gobelins was bought on June 6, 1662.<sup>20</sup> "The first and principal nucleus of weavers" consisted of men who had been employed by Fouquet at Maincy (Fenaille, I, 27), and who, as a result, had been without a patron since September 5th of the preceding year. Consequently, it seems reasonable to suppose that they displayed considerable alacrity in moving in and setting to work. According to Fenaille (II, viii-ix), the high-warp master-weavers Jans, Le Febvre and Laurent

yeux du plus grand Roy du monde, une action plus célèbre & plus signalée, puis que l'histoire la rapporte comme une des plus glorieuses qu'Alexandre ait jamais faites, à cause de la clémence & de la modération que ce Prince fit paroître en cette rencontre; car en se surmontant soy-mesme, il surmonta, non pas des peuples barbares, mais le Vainqueur de toutes les Nations" (pp. 30-31). This is only one example of the extremely close *rappart* that existed between Le Brun and Félibien.

17. *Mémoires pour les années 1661 et 1666*, ed. Jean Longnon (Paris, 1923), p. 131.

18. The 1694 edition of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie Françoise*, s.v. "vertu," speaks of "Efficacité, force, vigueur, propriété," and also of "Une habitude de l'ame qui la porte à faire le bien, & à fuir le mal. [...] On dit prov. Faire de nécessité vertu."

19. Fenaille, II, 169-70. The translations are from Sébastien LeClerc's engravings.

20. *Ibid.*, I, 87.

and the low-warp weaver Jean De la Croix had all moved in and begun work by the end of 1662.<sup>21</sup> By July of 1663, when the King made a formal visit to the Gobelins "Pour voir les rares industries / Des pompeuses Tapisseries," there were more than two hundred workers in the establishment (Loret, *La Muze historique*, IV, 80-81). This meant (according to Gerspach, p. 14) that the Gobelins was either at, or close to, its peak for the century.

From the year 1664, when Colbert was appointed *Surintendant des Bâtiments du Roi* and began keeping accounts, through the year 1680, we have records of heavy payments every year to the masterweavers (Guiffrey, *Comptes*, passim). In the year 1668 the payments for tapestries are itemized according to subject matter and include payments to Le Febvre, Jans and Laurent on the *Histoire d'Alexandre* (*ibid.*, cols. 287-88). Presumably it is on the basis of these payments that Jouin (p. 212) and others have assumed that the *Histoire d'Alexandre* was finished in that year. This evidence, however, is very slippery to handle. In the first place, the wording of the account states that payment is being made for a certain number of ells "d'ouvrages faits sur quatre pièces [different numbers for different chefs d'atelier] de l'*Histoire d'Alexandre*," thus indicating that the work paid for may be part of incomPLETED tapestries still on the loom. Secondly, there is no guarantee that the work is being paid for on time. For example, *Les Éléments* had been completed, inventoried, and given to the Prince of Tuscany on September 16, 1669, but were not fully paid for until February 27, 1670 (Fenaille, II, 57). Thirdly, we have no notion as to how much of the payments in the previous years may have been for work done on this series. Nevertheless, the important fact that emerges from these entries is that the second—and perhaps the third—complete series was already well started in 1668. The proof for this is the payment to Le Febvre of 5143 livres for slightly over twenty-four ells on four pieces of the *Histoire d'Alexandre* (Guiffrey, *Comptes*, cols. 287-88). Le Febvre did not work on the first set of hangings. He did do ten pieces on the second series and exactly four on the third series. This much at least is not a matter of conjecture; it is guaranteed by the markings and signatures on the tapestries themselves (Fenaille, II, 184; Gerspach, p. 78). Now Colbert might have been slow in paying for work already done, but he certainly never paid for work before it was done and inspected. Thus it becomes necessary to shift backwards by at least two years Fenaille's conjecture (II, 184) that the second copy was begun in 1670. It would also seem probable that one whole series of tapestries had been completed, or very nearly, and approved, before the Manufacture embarked on the second series. This would make the date

21. Gerspach, p. 54, lists only Jans in by 1662 and the others, plus the low-warp entrepreneur Jean-Baptiste Mozin, as having moved in 1663. This is one of those cases where the failure to indicate a source leaves us stranded. As a general rule I have found Fenaille to be much more reliable than Gerspach, but it does appear that Jans and his son enjoyed some kind of seniority in the Manufacture. Also, the evidence from Loret (IV, 80-81) given below, concerning the state of the Gobelins in 1663, leads me to side with Fenaille in this case.

for the completion of the first series 1667 or earlier, rather than 1680, as Fenaille would have it (*ibid.*).

It is my hypothesis that Le Brun immediately set to work and finished the series of paintings of the *Histoire d'Alexandre*, that the cartoons were immediately prepared, that the first set was begun without delay, and that it was finished long before the time heretofore supposed. Probably it will never be possible to prove or disprove this hypothesis completely, as it rests upon a number of facts, no one of which is conclusive, but I believe that it explains satisfactorily a number of otherwise meaningless conditions.

Fenaille casually says: "Lorsqu'il [Le Brun] fut placé à la tête de la nouvelle Manufacture des Gobelins, en 1663, il composa la suite des *Batailles* et du *Triomphe d'Alexandre*" (II, 167). In another place, however, he says: "Le Brun commença à travailler aux compositions de l'*Histoire du Roi* dès la création de la Manufacture royale des meubles de la Couronne, à la fin de l'année 1662" (II, 99). Neither of these statements is at all conclusive, because, again, he does not tell us how he knows these slightly contradictory things. On the other hand, it does seem quite plausible that, left to his own devices, Le Brun would immediately continue to exploit a vein which he had found so eminently rewarding.<sup>22</sup> There is the further probability that he would choose something known to be pleasing to the King with which to launch his new *Manufacture*. One thing certain is that the remaining pictures were painted at the Gobelins with an eye to reproduction in tapestries, as this letter from one of the first high-warp weavers indicates:

Monsieur,

Deffunct Monsieur Le Brun a peint luy-même les cinq tableaux de l'*Histoire d'Alexandre*, et ainsi il a peint toutes les figures d'Alexandre des dits tableaux.

Il peignit la *Famille de Darius* en présence du Roy à Fontainebleau; la *Bataille du Granique* et celle d'*Arbelles* et de *Poros*, ainsi que le *Triomphe*, ont esté peints icy par luy-même, j'en suis témoin oculaire.

Je suis, Monsieur, votre tres humble et obeissant serviteur,

Jans.

Des Gobelins, le 5<sup>e</sup> mars 1694.<sup>23</sup>

Jouin's commitment to the terminal date of 1668 led him into creating an elaborate romance about how Le Brun's trip to the front in 1667 inspired him to finish the series of *Les Batailles d'Alexandre* (pp. 213 ff.). He was so carried away by this notion that he overlooked conclusive evidence to the contrary right in his own book. Some seventy pages earlier he

22. Adolphe Hullebroeck, *Peintres de cartons pour tapisseries: Charles Le Brun* (Paris and Liège, 1941) agrees in this matter as he does on the 1661 date for the *Tente* (pp. 28, 30).

23. Quoted by Fenaille, II, 168. This letter rather destroys Gerspach's hypothesis that a series of the *Histoire d'Alexandre* had been worked on at Maincy (see above, n. 9).

quotes a very important entry from the *Journal d'Olivier Lefèvre d'Ormesson*: Le lundy 30 novembre 1665, feste de Saint André, je fus disner aux Gobelins avec M. Le Brun.[...] Nous vismes les tableaux admirables des *Victoires d'Alexandre* et des principales actions du Roy, dont le Roy fait faire de belles tapisseries[...].<sup>24</sup> How many *Victoires d'Alexandre* were there? Unfortunately, the one we are most interested in, the *Porus*, was presumably the third battle painted. All we can say is that the wording sounds as though it refers to an already famous series of more than two victories.

To return for a moment to the *Famille de Darius*: Félibien's description, printed sometime in 1663, states that the picture had been hung in the King's *Cabinet des Peintures* (*Les Reines de Perse*, p. 52). Now, if we allow a certain margin to Le Brun to put the finishing touches to his picture and a margin to Félibien to write his essay, get it approved and printed, this means that the picture must have been hung between the beginning of 1662 and the middle of 1663. In that case it seems certain that the cartoon for the weavers' use must have been made somewhere inside the limits of that same interval. After all, the King's *Cabinet des Peintures* was a very different organization from today's *Musée du Louvre*—one cannot imagine that a copyist could simply come in and start making a full-size cartoon in the midst of the court and the royal household.

Thus, we have plausibly established that the models for most, if not all, of the tapestries in the Alexander series were available from 1662–1663 to 1665. Before going on to any further conjectures, let us take into account one further bit of evidence. La Gravette de Mayolas, in a *lettre en vers* of June 14, 1665, speaks of Le Brun's

[...] ornements en broderie  
Et sa riche Tapisserie,  
Où sont artistement dépeints  
Des Apôtres les Actes saints;  
Sa Statira, son Alexandre,  
Dont les beautez peuvent surprendre, etc.<sup>25</sup>

Again, we cannot pin down the language sufficiently to know whether he is referring to one tapestry or more than one. What we can say at least is that the *Famille de Darius* had been completely woven and placed on exhibition by this date.

Even so, we are left with a period of between two and four years, during which time we do not know what was taking place. There are two main approaches for narrowing down this period: one is to examine what the tapestry-weavers were doing and the other is to examine what Le Brun was doing. In addition to the *Histoire d'Alexandre* and the *Histoire du Roi*,

24. *Journal d'Olivier Lefèvre d'Ormesson et Extraits des Mémoires d'André Lefèvre d'Ormesson*, ed. M. Chéruel (Paris, 1861), II, 412–13, as quoted in Jouin, pp. 141–42.

25. *Les Continuateurs de Loret: Lettres en vers de La Gravette de Mayolas [...] et autres*, ed. Baron James de Rothschild (Paris, 1881–82), I, col. 44.

payments were made in 1668 on *Les Saisons*, *Les Mois*, *Les Éléments*, *Les Actes des Apôtres* and *L'Histoire de Mélèagre* (Guiffrey, *Comptes*, cols. 287-88). We know that *The Nine Muses* also were done by May, 1666 (*Les Continuateurs*, I, col. 834), but neither they nor the *Mélèagre* concern us here because they were done almost entirely on low-warp looms (Gerspach, pp. 60, 76). We may place the beginning of the *Actes des Apôtres* in 1664 if we allow (with Gersprach, p. 68) that the models were copied by the King's pensioners in Rome from 1664 to 1673, and put that together with the fact that some of that series had already been woven and exhibited to the King in June 1665 (*Les Continuateurs*, I, col. 43). According to Fenaille *Les Mois* would have been begun between 1666 and 1667 (II, 128), but the other three series would all have been started in 1664 (II, 51, 57, 69, 184)! If this were true it would mean that three high-warp entrepreneurs, *chefs d'atelier*, surrounded by scores of weavers, did nothing from the time they moved in 1662 until sometime in 1664, except complete a few odd jobs begun at Maincy and change the escutcheon on some of them (Gerspach, pp. 60-76). Obviously, something must have been started earlier on some of the series. It is my contention that the Alexander series was begun and put well on the road to completion before 1664.<sup>28</sup>

Most of these same arguments apply also to Le Brun. His activities are fairly well documented through the year 1661 and beginning again with 1664-65. In 1664 a letter from Cassagne to Colbert indicates that he was already quite well along on the *Histoire du Roi*, it being a question of the inscriptions on *La Paix* and *Le Mariage* (Fenaille, II, 99).

The reasoning which leads me to suppose that the Alexander tapestries must have been anterior to the other series is in part based upon the dissertation by Félibien mentioned earlier. At the end of the description of *Les Reines de Perse aux pieds d'Alexandre* (pp. 65-66) he makes a very important statement:

Mais un pinceau si sçavant ne doit pas s'arrester davantage à honorer les Princes de Grece; ils ont eû leurs Appelés & leurs Zeuxis. Et puis que nous sommes dans un siecle où la France fournit des choses si mémorables, & qui seront sans doute l'admiration des siecles à venir; il faut qu'il s'occupe à des sujets plus nouveaux & plus étendus. Car comme nous avons le bonheur d'estre gouvernez par un Monarque qui efface tout ce que ces anciens Conquerans ont fait de plus signalé, cet excellent Peintre peut-il mieux employer ses veilles, & faire paroistre ses riches talens, qu'à représenter les hautes actions de V. M. & de tant de vertus qu'elle possede, nous en faire une Peinture, qui soit à l'avenir le plus délicieux objet de nos regards?

Quand il entreprendra de si dignes Ouvrages, on y verra V. M. comme nous la voyons dans l'Histoire, c'est-à-dire, qu'Elle paroistra toujours admirable & glorieuse. Et ce fidelle Peintre marquera avec des traits si forts & si hardis vostre Image, qu'on n'aura pas peine à la connoistre.

26. One good reason for not dating *Les Éléments* earlier is the motto on the *Air*, "Ludovicus XIII HOSTIUM [...] VICTOR." This could not have been said before 1666 or 1667.

This exhortation to leave Antiquity in order to concentrate directly, rather than by allusion or allegory, on Louis XIV must have been inspired by the knowledge that Le Brun was going to begin his *Histoire du Roi*. In view of the close collaboration between Le Brun and Félibien, it seems unlikely that Félibien would make such a vehement case for abandoning the "Princes of Greece" unless Le Brun were close to the end of his *Histoire d'Alexandre*.

I would revise the chronology, then, as follows: (1) early 1662, perhaps even before the formal *acte* of purchase, Le Brun moves into the Hôtel des Gobelins, along with Jans, *père et fils*, and immediately sets about finishing the *Histoire d'Alexandre* while Jans and the other weavers who also begin to move in finish up and remodel the tapestries begun at Maincy; (2) the cartoon of the *Tente de Darius* is painted at this same time; (3) the *Tente de Darius* is hung in the Royal *Cabinet des Peintures* late in 1662; (4) Le Brun decides to paint *L'Histoire du Roi* as he finishes *L'Histoire d'Alexandre*; (5) Félibien writes *Les Reines de Perse*, which heralds Le Brun's change of mode; (6) meanwhile, beginning in mid-1662, or late 1662, Jans, *père et fils*, and Henry Laurens begin to weave *L'Histoire d'Alexandre*; (7) the *Manufacture* grows rapidly, even if Loret's figure of two hundred workers by July of 1663 is an exaggeration; (8) by the King's visit in July 1663, the Alexander series is well on the way to completion but is not yet finished;<sup>27</sup> (9) the King approves of what he sees, and Lefebvre is immediately set to work on the second series of *L'Histoire d'Alexandre*;<sup>28</sup> (10) 1663-64, Le Brun works on *L'Histoire du Roi*; (11) *Les Actes des Apôtres* are begun in 1664 and some hangings are completed and exhibited to the King in June, 1665; (12) 1664, first tapestries of *L'Histoire du Roi* placed on high-warp looms; (13) 1664-65, Le Brun works on *Les Saisons*, which are then placed on the looms immediately; (14) 1666-67, Le Brun, among other things, works on *Les Mois* and *Les Éléments*, which are also placed on the looms immediately. Admittedly, there is a great deal of conjecture in this reconstruction, but it does have the merit of organizing all the available documentary evidence in a more reasonable and coherent pattern than the previous chronologies. This reconstruction does two things: it accounts for the activities of Le Brun and the *Manufacture* for a considerable period of time when the latter was close to its full strength; it also makes use of a notion of progression in the mode of representing the King's virtues.

It is still within the realm of possibility that Jouin's "historiens contem-

27. If the series had been completed, the chances are good that Loret would have mentioned it. My hypothesis that the Alexander series was the chief occupation of the *Manufacture* at that time helps, however, to account for the labored rhyme, *Flandre-Alexandre* in Loret's account (*La Muse historique*, IV, 80).

28. This theory accounts both for what Lefebvre was doing from 1663 until 1664 and for the fact that Lefebvre's *atelier* did all but two of the tapestries in the second series (Fenaille, II, 184; Gerspach, p. 78).

"porains" are correct and that Le Brun painted *Le Triomphe "vers 1668"* (p. 212) after having participated in Louis' triumphal entry into Paris, although from the standpoint of symmetry and the continuing emphasis on *virtus* it seems unlikely.<sup>29</sup> It is also barely possible that the *Porus* was not among the *Batailles d'Alexandre* which Le Fèvre d'Ormesson saw on November 30, 1665. We must still consider Professor May's suggestion that Racine's play perhaps gave Le Brun the idea for that specific episode (above, n. 13). Two pieces of information from greatly differing sources, however, convince us that Le Brun had decided on the *Porus* long before Racine's play. In the controversy over Racine's *Alexandre le Grand* Saint-Evremond regretted the lack of local color, the absence of heroic battle descriptions, the failure to mention the fact that Porus was mounted on the largest elephant (Adam, *Histoire*, IV, 337-38). Le Brun, on the other hand, "le félicitait d'avoir 'retranché de sa narration que Porus était alors monté sur un éléphant' parce que l'image de cet animal exotique aurait 'effarouché' l'oreille des auditeurs et troublé la subordination du détail, l'unité, l'harmonie de l'œuvre d'art" (ibid., p. 338). Now, it is precisely this detail which turns up again in the *Inventaire général des modèles de 1690*, where we find a full-size cartoon for a tapestry which was never executed: "Une grande bataille où Porus est monté sur un éléphant, ébauchée par le Sr Verdier, d'après le dessin de M. Le Brun, composée de trois morceaux contenant ensemble 39 pieds sur 14'" (quoted by Fenaille, II, 168). It is clear that Le Brun was talking from his own intimate past experience when he congratulated Racine on cutting out the elephant. (In the tapestry as executed Porus is carried by four men.) It seems only reasonable to suppose that the *Bataille de Porus* was anterior to Racine's play, and probably a regular part of the *Batailles d'Alexandre*—it would be hard to imagine such a series without this, Alexander's most difficult battle and one of his most famous acts of magnanimity.

There remains the other possibility to be explored: did Racine take the idea for his play from Le Brun? Just looking at the probabilities it would seem easier to believe that Racine derived his idea from Le Brun than it would be to understand why no one else thought of the idea before Racine did. (The subject had been treated only once before, by the abbé Claude Boyer in 1647). Let us look at the circumstances surrounding the genesis of Racine's second play. Towards the end of 1663 Racine was finishing *Le Thébaïde* and was admitted to the *lever du Roi* (Mesnard, I, 58, 60). What could be more natural for an ambitious young man than to seek to imitate the most dazzlingly successful artist of recent times? What could be more natural for him than to seek an almost identical subject in the life of Alexander, in which the fact of victory is relegated to the background

29. Since Le Brun, despite Jouin, did not need the experience of modern warfare before painting the *Batailles d'Alexandre*, he can hardly have needed to witness a modern triumphal procession in order to paint Alexander's entry into Babylon.

while "le véritable sujet de la pièce [n'est] autre chose que la générosité de ce conquérant" (*Première Préface*). The subject of *Porus* and Alexander is much like the encounter with the family of Darius in that it too represents a victory of Alexander's self-control. If Racine did make his choice in the manner I am implying, the great emphasis on *vertu* was not lost on him. With astonishingly delicate tact at the service of his craven flattery, he took a hint from Plutarch and toyed with a contrast between luck in arms and virtue. At the end of the play Porus says to Alexandre:

Seigneur, jusqu'à ce jour l'univers en alarmes  
Me forçoit d'admirer le bonheur de vos armes;  
Mais rien ne me forçoit, en ce commun effroi,  
De reconnoître en vous plus de vertus qu'en moi:  
Je me rends; je vous cède une pleine victoire.  
Vos vertus, je l'avoue, égalent votre gloire.

(V, iii, 1529-34)

Racine could not, like Le Brun, paint the features of his Alexandre to resemble Louis XIV, but in his Dedicatory Epistle to the King he says that Louis' *gloire* is as widespread as Alexander's and that the whole earth keeps silent before him. "Je sais bien que ce silence est un silence d'étonnement et d'admiration, que jusques ici la force de vos armes ne leur a pas tant imposé que celle de vos vertus" (*Oeuvres*, I, 513). He then goes on to compare Alexander's conquests, built on youth and luck, with Louis' wisdom, "un chemin plus nouveau et plus difficile" (pp. 513-14). Later on, he speaks again of His Majesty's "vertus" (p. 515). On the title page of the first edition there is "une vignette représentant une Minerve qui terrasse le démon de l'Envie, avec la devise: *Virtus invidiam superat*" (p. 498, n. 1). Finally, there is an interesting and perhaps significant coincidence between Le Brun's motto for the *Porus* tapestry, SIC VIRTUS ET VICTA PLACET, and a phrase in Racine's *Première Préface*, defending Ephestion's praise of Porus in the latter's presence, "Cela s'appelle rendre justice à la vertu, et la respecter même dans les fers" (p. 518).

Having decided on the subject and the means of approach for his second play, Racine, with his excellent classical education, easily did the research necessary for the background of his play. But he also had one eye on Le Brun. He had arrived fresh from Uzès probably in the spring of 1663 to hear all Paris talking about Le Brun's meteoric success, to see the flourishing Gobelins *Manufacture*, to read about Le Brun's *Alexandre* in Loret's *Muze historique* (IV, 81), and to learn that Félibien was being given a handsome pension for his descriptions of the royal art treasures because of a book he had published describing *Les Reines de Perse* (Guiffrey, *Comptes*, cols. 113, 161, 162 et passim). Should it surprise us that he completed his research by reading Félibien's book? Perhaps he turned to Félibien's work, which is couched in the form of an epistle to the King, when writing

his own Dedicatory Epistle to the King. Several of Racine's phrases are strongly reminiscent of Félibien. Racine felt the force of Félibien's admonition to abandon the heroes of antiquity for Louis XIV, but turned it aside deftly, "Mais, SIRE, je ne songe pas qu'en voulant louer Votre Majesté, je m'engage dans une carrière trop vaste et trop difficile. Il faut avantageant m'essayer encore sur quelques autres héros de l'antiquité" (*Oeuvres*, I, 514). Writing in December of 1665, Racine was able to sense the preparations for the campaign of the following spring, so that he could make bold to say, "et je prévois qu'à mesure que je prendrai de nouvelles forces, Votre Majesté se couvrira Elle-même d'une gloire toute nouvelle; que nous La reverrons peut-être, à la tête d'une armée,achever la comparaison qu'on peut faire d'Elle et d'Alexandre, et ajouter le titre de conquérant à celui du plus sage roi de la terre" (pp. 514-15). Félibien had had to content himself with *vertu*, "cet excellent Peintre peut-il mieux employer désormais ses veilles [...] qu'à représenter les hautes actions de V. M. & de tant de vertus qu'elle possède, nous en faire une Peinture [...]?" (*Les Reines de Perse*, p. 66). But Racine is able to use the same words with more *éclat*: "Ce sera alors que vos sujets devront consacrer toutes leurs veilles au récit de tant de grandes actions [...]" And, Racine continues, "ne pas souffrir que Votre Majesté ait lieu de se plaindre, comme Alexandre, qu'Elle n'a eu personne de son temps qui pût laisser à la postérité la mémoire de ses vertus. Je n'espère pas être assez heureux pour me distinguer par le mérite de mes ouvrages; mais je sais bien que je me signalerai au moins par le zèle et la profonde vénération avec laquelle je suis [etc.]" (p. 515). It has been remarked fairly often that in these lines Racine seemed to foresee his career as royal historiographer. Raymond Picard in the Pléiade edition of Racine notes: "Voilà qui est curieusement prophétique. Racine ne prévoit pas seulement la transformation de Louis XIV en roi guerrier qui semble avoir à cœur de justifier la comparaison qu'on a faite de lui et d'Alexandre: il a une étrange prescience de ce que sera sa carrière de 1677 à sa mort" (I, 1093). As I have suggested, the change in Louis XIV must have been apparent by the time Racine was writing his Epistle, and, as for the fore-knowledge of his future career, that also may be less mysterious. Perhaps in those lines, as in the preceding ones, he was once again echoing Félibien, who terminated *Les Reines de Perse* thus: "Que j'aurois de joye, Sire, s'il m'estoit un jour permis d'estre l'Interprete de ces merveilleux Tableaux, afin d'avoir au moins la gloire de faire voir à tout le monde avec combien de respect & de passion je suis [etc.]" (pp. 66-67).

Racine's play was an immediate success. The King was pleased and accepted the dedication. Racine had caught the vogue of Alexander at the perfect moment, when novelty and curiosity were blended in just the right proportions. Although we like to think of Racine's career as beginning with *Andromaque*, in the seventeenth century it was *Alexandre* which established Racine as the most promising successor to Corneille. His material success

never came close to equalling Le Brun's, but even so, considering what he had been before and what he became overnight, Racine had good reason to congratulate himself for a firm and astute move. The play was generally considered a masterpiece for the remainder of the century,<sup>30</sup> but by the middle of the eighteenth century when Louis Racine wrote his *Remarques sur les tragédies de J. Racine*, it had disappeared from the stage (Racine, *Œuvres*, I, 512), and now is occasionally revived only as a curiosity. As a work of art in itself *Alexandre le Grand* holds little interest for us today, but situated in its context it is an excellent illustration of the oft-repeated notion that there was a unity and a harmony of the arts under Louis XIV. In this re-telling of the principal events in the history of Alexander in the seventeenth century we have seen a concrete example of how they interacted and of how the King's personality impressed itself directly and indirectly, on these two artists, in their works and their fortunes. There is also the melancholy reflexion that perhaps Louis XIV took all the comparisons with Alexander too seriously, that the works of art in turn had an effect on the character of the King, causing him to embark on ill-advised campaigns which brought the nation to the edge of disaster. If so, it is one of the minor ironies of history that the plight of the royal finances forced the great Gobelins *Manufacture* to shut down from 1694 to 1699 (Gerspach, p. 13).

30. It seems fantastic that in 1672—after *Britannicus*, *Bérénice* and *Bajazet*—Mme de Sévigné could write: "Jamais Racine n'ira plus loin qu'*Alexandre* et qu'*Andromaque*" (quoted in Racine, *Œuvres*, I, 497, n. 2).

## SEVEN LETTERS OF PAUL VERLAINE

By Robert J. Niess

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

The following letters of Paul Verlaine, which as far as I can determine are unpublished, form part of the valuable Salem collection now in Harvard's Houghton Library. I publish them here by the kind permission of Madame Raphaël Salem, who inherited them from her father, the late Federico Gentili di Giuseppe; I do not know when or from whom M. Gentili di Giuseppe acquired these manuscripts. Five of these seven letters are in the original manuscript in the Salem collection; the other two, addressed to Léon Vanier, are in English translation. I publish them in this form because of their documentary interest. The first three letters (one is only a fragment) date from a period of Verlaine's life when not much correspondence is available for tracing his movements and literary activities; the two translations of letters to Léon Vanier, along with the one to Félix Régamey, were written toward the beginning of Verlaine's epic years of poverty and glory; the last one was dated less than two years before the poet's death, at the time when he was in the clutches of the "Amies" and their "amis." In their ensemble, these letters offer something of an epitome of the life and career of "Pauvre Lélian."

### I. LETTER TO ARMAND GOUZIEN

Armand Gouzien (1839-92), an early friend of Verlaine's (two letters, tentatively dated 1869 and 1870, are addressed to him in the *Correspondance de Paul Verlaine*, vol. III), was contributing a daily column, "L'Esprit des autres," to *Le Gaulois* at the time Verlaine wrote him this letter. Gouzien later became "secrétaire de la rédaction" of *La Revue des Lettres et des Arts* and at the close of his career was Inspecteur des Beaux-Arts. I have found no indication that he did what Verlaine asked of him in this letter.

Lundi soir [October 19, 1868]

Mon cher Gouzien,

Seriez-vous assez aimable pour signaler dans le *Gaulois* d'un de ces jours le paragraphe ci-joint de la *Vie parisienne* de mon ami Edmond Lepelletier (*Nain Jaune* de ce soir Lundi) relatif à un strabisme dont m'ornait hier M. Magnard<sup>1</sup> qui a été

1. In *Le Nain Jaune* for Monday, October 19, 1868, Lepelletier wrote: "M. Catulle Mendès, le lumineux fantaisiste, burine en ce moment dans la *Vogue Parisienne* quelques médaillons de poètes nouveaux. On a surtout remarqué la figurine de Paul Verlaine. M. Francis Magnard reproche au blond poète qui raconta jadis les souffrances mystiques de *Panteleïa*, de n'avoir pas assez insisté sur le strabisme de Paul Verlaine. Hâtons-nous de dire que chez ce jeune poète saturnien nous n'avons trouvé rien de louche [...] si ce n'est peut-être le regard malicieux que M. Magnard a dirigé sur lui dans le *Figaro* d'hier." In *Le Figaro* of the same date (actually

bien généreux puisqu'il pouvait et n'a pas voulu me gratifier encore de bosses, goitres, hernies et de toutes autres affections excentriques qui eussent pu lui passer par la tête. Je dois sans doute ce trait délicat aux attentions toutes anonymes du sympathique et récent "bagatellier" toulousain du *Figaro*,<sup>3</sup> raison de plus peut-être pour moi de le laisser tomber.

Mais un riche mariage est si vite manqué!  
Mille remerciements et mille amitiés.

P. Verlaine

Rue Lécluse 26, Batignolles

## II. FRAGMENT OF A LETTER TO ERNEST DELAHAYE

This fragment figured in a sale of manuscripts conducted by Blaizot on March 12, 1936, but I do not know if it was acquired by M. Gentili di Giuseppe then or later. Written on the back of a manuscript poem, published in revised form in *Parallèlement* as "A la manière de Paul Verlaine," the fragment was described by Blaizot as addressed to Arthur Rimbaud. This attribution is almost certainly false, for there is abundant evidence that Delahaye was its recipient: there is a reference to a "comédie" and in two letters to Delahaye Verlaine speaks of a "stupide comédie" and a "Sale Bête de Comédie" (October 26, 1875 and November 27, 1875); it mentions Germain Nouveau as "Nouve," as does Delahaye himself; it asks the recipient to send "bonshommes" and it is known that Delahaye and Verlaine exchanged a considerable number of sketches during Verlaine's stay at Andrews' grammar school at Stickney, Lincolnshire. Lastly, the fragment makes reference to Delahaye's refusal to visit Verlaine in England and in a letter of May 23, 1876, Verlaine says "Quel dommage toi pas pouvoir ou pas croire pouvoir bouger de tes Ardromphes!"<sup>4</sup>

Sunday, the eighteenth), Magnard wrote as follows in his column, "Paris au jour le jour": "Est-ce que M. Catulle Mendès baisserait: ses figurines de poètes dans la *Vogue Parisienne* ne ruissellent pas du tout d'inouïsme; c'est en termes assez sobres qu'il rend justice à un grand poète, M. Leconte de Lisle. A peine se rattrape-t-il sur le profil, étonnant d'ailleurs, de M. Paul Verlaine [...] Je suis étonné que M. Mendès n'ait pas divinisé le strabisme qui dépare—pardon! qui complète—M. Verlaine. Ces jeunes poètes, dont trois ont d'ailleurs un vrai talent forment une bande très curieuse à étudier." These remarks were occasioned by Mendès' brief sketch of Verlaine in *La Vogue Parisienne* ("Figurines de poètes") for October 16, 1868, the first paragraph of which reads thus: "Moins joli que le précédent [i.e., Alphonse Daudet], mais plus sérieux. Ce poète ne ressemble point à Ganimède, non plus, et si jamais il est emporté dans l'air, ce sera par le ballon de Nadar et non par l'aigle de Jupiter! Mais dans ses traits tourmentés il y a la vie, dans ses yeux la vision, et dans son front le rêve. Rien de vulgaire dans sa laideur hardie. Il gagne ceci à ne pas être Léandre, qu'il est impossible de le prendre pour un niais. D'ailleurs sa tête sied à son œuvre. A cet esprit chercheur du bizarre et briseur du convenu, il fallait un masque imprévu. Avec des joues roses, ce songeur funèbre eût été absurde. S'il est camard, c'est comme la Mort."

2. He probably means Paul Arène, although the latter was not from Toulouse. At this time Arène, who had collaborated with Daudet and others in the writing of *Le Parnassicule contemporain* not long before and whom Verlaine had met at Nina de Callias's soirées, contributed an occasional column, "Bagatelles," to *Le Figaro*.

3. *Correspondance de Paul Verlaine*, ed. Van Bever (Paris: Messein, 1922-29), III, 110-11, 111-15, 116. On the name "Nouve" see Jean-Marie Carré, *Autour de Verlaine et de Rimbaud* (Paris: Université de Paris, 1949), p. 17, n. 2, letter of September, 1875. Carré reproduces dozens of Verlaine's and Delahaye's sketches.

That the letter was written from Stickney seems beyond doubt. "La ville" is certainly Boston, for Verlaine refers to it that way several times in letters to Delahaye and others, and the priest who is to aid him very probably is Father Sabela, whom Verlaine describes in his "Notes on England—Myself as a French Master" as his friend in Boston.<sup>4</sup> Moreover, the reference to leaving his post is paralleled by several other such remarks in letters to Delahaye and Blémont in the fall of 1875.

Dating the fragment offers a more difficult problem. André Fontaine, who published some lines of the fragment,<sup>5</sup> believes it was written about November 1, 1875, and there is at least one good reason for accepting his view. In the two letters to Delahaye of the fall of 1875 the comedy on which Verlaine is apparently working is mentioned in such terms as to make it appear that it was the one referred to in the last line of the fragment. On October 26, 1875 Verlaine concludes his letter by saying: "Fin du volumphe. Ma prochaine contiendra des vers nouveaux. Puis la comédie annoncée." (*Corr.*, III, 111). A month later, on November 27, 1875, he again closes with a reference to the work: "A bientôt donc de nouveaux Chedoeufs.—En attendant 4 et 5 de la Sale Bête de Comédie secundum Dhervillum" (*ibid.*, p. 114). This evidence, of course, is not conclusive but it indicates that the fragment might be of about the same time. It might also be noted that one line of the poem on the back of this letter seems to bear out Fontaine's contention. If the following strophe can be taken at face value, it would seem that the poem—and probably also the letter—must date from the fall of 1875:

J'ai frémi comme un archet frivole  
Sur la fibre pâle qui détonne  
De cette fin de cette pâle automne.  
J'ai frémi comme une aile qui vole!

But this hypothesis seems to be invalidated by other aspects of Verlaine's correspondence in the fall of 1875. In the first of the letters to Delahaye cited above (October 26, 1875) Verlaine describes his uncertainty about his situation with Andrews: "Ta lettre annonçant ton change prochain me trouve précisément en train d'attendre renseignements pour Boston, où j'ai l'intention de m'établir, milieu ou fin gbre (date de l'expiration de mon 'engagement'). Point encore parlé à W. A. Attends d'avoir 'secured' quelques leçons et ville, histoire de payer mon logement et ma nourriture. Je pense que lui, W. A., ne demanderait pas mieux que de me garder, mais comme il ne pourrait m'offrir qu'un paiement trop léger [...] je préfère Boston" (*Corr.*, III, 110). One day later he repeated the same idea in a letter to Emile Blémont (II, 6-8), and in another letter to Blémont (November 19, 1875), he goes into some detail as to his plans: "Je pense que je partirai bientôt d'ici pour une situation plus rétribuante, en ville, c'est-à-dire à Boston. J'attends de jour en jour une lettre de cette dernière 'sous-

4. *Fortnightly Review*, new series, LVI (1894), 70-80.

5. André Fontaine, *Verlaine homme de lettres* (Paris: Delagrave, 1937), p. 140.

préfecture,' pour être fixé sur l'époque, qui peut être très prochaine, et ne dépassera Noël, en tous cas" (*ibid.*, p. 14). A little later, on November 27, 1875, Verlaine wrote to Delahaye: "Je m'épuise actuellement en demandes pour améliorer ma *situate*. Dès qu'il sut mes *intentcheunes* quittatoires, mon brave 'employer' me promit hautes payes et 'plenty of comfortabilities'; ce qui me décide à rester 'till Christmas'" (*Corr.*, III, 113). But the March 1876 fragment published below indicates clearly that Verlaine has made definite arrangements to terminate his employment and makes no mention of any situation in Boston. The only other detail that could throw any light on the matter is the presence of Germain Nouveau in Paris. Unfortunately, no evidence can be found there, for Nouveau was in Paris both in the fall of 1875 and in the spring of 1876.<sup>6</sup> All in all, it seems safest to conclude that the fragment dates from some days before Verlaine's departure from Stickney (about April 1, 1876), that is, from March 1876. This conclusion is reinforced by the reference in the letter of May 23, 1876 in which Verlaine regrets that Delahaye will not join him in England.<sup>7</sup> Then what of the comedy mentioned in the fragment? I have found nothing to shed any light on this matter, but have concluded for lack of a better hypothesis that Verlaine was collaborating on a comedy with Germain Nouveau or was helping him correct his verses; that Nouveau sent him the work in installments and that Verlaine returned them to him in the same fashion. Verlaine was notably dilatory in completing the volumes he projected—witness, for instance, the constant postponements of *Amour*—and it is quite possible that he had intended to return Nouveau's work to him in the fall of 1875 or winter of 1875–76, but did not get to the business until the spring of the latter year. Certainly this hypothesis has Verlaine's psychology and working habits in its favor, whatever it may lack in documentary support.<sup>8</sup>

[Stickney, March 1876]

... Informe-moi des beaux mystères!

Parlé hier à mes bonshommes. Très-probablement quitterai fin du mois. Quitte en très bons termes et emporterai *testimonial* magnifique. Me fixerai pour un temps en la ville, où prêtre (Loyola!)<sup>9</sup> m'aidera.<sup>10</sup> Ecris ici jusqu'à nouvel ordre.

6. Germain Nouveau, *Oeuvres politiques*, ed. Jules Mouquet and Jacques Brenner (Paris: Gallimard, 1953), I, 19, 30.

7. The MS bears the pencilled notation "1876," but I do not know if it was Delahaye or some other owner who dated it. V. P. Underwood (*Verlaine et l'Angleterre* [Paris: Nizet, 1956], p. 287) agrees that the date should be March 1876, and that the letter was addressed to Delahaye, not Rimbaud. Underwood quotes most of the fragment (pp. 262–63, 273 and 287), giving the Blaizot catalogue as his source.

8. Underwood says (p. 273) that there exists a letter from Germain Nouveau to Verlaine, dated October 20, 1875, which mentions a "drame bouffe en vers." It is possible that Verlaine and Nouveau had agreed to collaborate in writing a comedy à la d'Hervilly and that Delahaye was serving as intermediary between them.

9. When Verlaine became aggressively religious in the first years after his conversion, Rimbaud took to calling him "Loyola", among other less complimentary names.

10. In his account in the *Fortnightly Review* of his dealings with Father Sabela, Verlaine says nothing of the priest's aiding him.

Nouve à Paris travaille. T'ai-je dit qu'il ne manque jamais de me demander nouvelles de toi? Un véritablement charmant garçon, toute "propagande" à part.<sup>11</sup>

Tes raisons de rester en France sont excellentes.<sup>12</sup> Mais que diable me parles-tu d'aventures *romantiques*? Rien n'est plus *popote et train-train* que ma vie et que la vie des Français dans mon cas. C'est-à-dire que Charleville est une orgie en comparaison! Retire *romantique*, retire bien vite. Et toujours à ta disposition si cœur t'en dit *about England*. Et ne manque pas de me répondre bientôt, long, avec masses de déguisés et de bonshommes.

Ci-joint 1<sup>er</sup> envoi de la stupide comédie.

Ta vieille et fidèle

P. V.

### III. LETTER TO NINA DE CALLIAS (NINA DE VILLARS)

Although Nina's name does not appear in this letter, it is clear from the reference to Madame Gaillard, Nina's mother, that it was addressed to Verlaine's friend and hostess of the good old days before his marriage.

The letter, which provides the only documentary information we possess about Verlaine's movements between May 23 and December 26, 1876, is chiefly important in that it indicates that Verlaine very probably visited Paris in the spring or summer of that year and that he was again in contact with his old friends of Nina's group at that time; there had been no previous evidence that he had had anything to do with Nina or her familiars much after 1872. In a letter to Delahaye of May 23, 1876 (*Corr.*, III, 15-16), Verlaine says he is going to London on June first to stay until mid-July, then will vacation in France in August and the first days of September. The following letter indicates that he left London at about the time he had planned, or perhaps a little earlier.

Arras, le 13 juillet 1876

Chère Madame,

Je n'ai vraiment pu assister à votre fête et ai dû partir hier matin même pour ici où j'ai retrouvé ma mère en bonne santé et bien heureuse. Je suis sûr que vous ne m'en voudrez pas un instant et que Madame Gaillard m'aura également excusé.

Je reste ici jusqu'à Lundi matin, jour auquel je vais 'faire les foins'

chez M. Julien Dehée, à Fampoux, près d'Arras, Pas-de-Calais, pour une 15<sup>e</sup>,

11. It is possible that Delahaye did not yet know Nouveau personally, although he had been in correspondence with him for some time. André Fontaine claims that they did not meet until 1876 (op. cit., p. 135). The rather cryptic phrase about "propaganda" probably means that Verlaine, who may have considered Nouveau as something of a protégé, since he had been partly responsible for his conversion, was "building him up" to Delahaye.

12. The reasons probably were that Delahaye had just taken up his duties as *répétiteur* in the Collège Notre-Dame at Rethel; in 1875 he was employed in the city hall of Charleville and went to Rethel in February 1876. Whatever the date of this fragment, Fall 1875, or Spring 1876, it seems unlikely that Delahaye would be able to leave France for a pleasure trip.

après quoi retour ici jusqu'à ce départ pour l'Angleterre vers le milieu du mois prochain.<sup>13</sup>

Amitiés à tous et mes meilleures civilités à Mme Gaillard.

Votre dévoué  
P. Verlaine

#### IV-V. TRANSLATIONS OF TWO LETTERS TO LÉON VANIER

The two translations which follow are published here because of the light they shed on the composition of *Amour* and *Bonheur*, as well as *Histoires comme ça* and *Les Hommes d'aujourd'hui*, and because they allow a further glimpse into the background of the famous affair of "Décadisme," in which Verlaine was almost made—or almost made himself—the titular head of the Décadent wing of contemporary poets. I have no idea of the whereabouts of the originals, though I am as certain as one can ever be when dealing with Verlaine's correspondence that they have not been published.

The two translations are accompanied in the Salem collection by a covering letter from a certain "Norton," whom I have not succeeded in identifying. This letter, written from the Hôtel Continental in Paris on February 10, 1898, indicates that "Norton," acting on a request from an American friend, identified only as "Charlie," had purchased some Verlaine letters from Léon Vanier. The translations published below were included by "Norton" to aid his friend in deciphering Verlaine's difficult handwriting and were accompanied by a photograph of Verlaine at the Café de la Source; this photograph, which is not mentioned in the various iconographies of Verlaine, does not accompany the translations in the Salem collection and I do not know its present whereabouts.

The translations are in general adequate and so directly render Verlaine's words that it is easy to reconstitute the original expressions. However, the translator, who knew French well but who was evidently not quite an expert, does make some slight errors which I have corrected as far as possible. He also left some words in French. I have not touched these except to correct a few obvious misreadings. I have eliminated the frequent explanatory passages which he included in brackets but I have of course respected Verlaine's parentheses.

One interesting note in the covering letter comes in the writer's remark that Vanier had shown him a "whole pile of manuscripts" left by Verlaine and which Vanier had refused to allow to appear in Charles Donos's *Verlaine intime*, which Vanier's firm was soon to publish, because they were much too frank and too revealing of certain of Verlaine's tendencies. One wonders where this "pile" is now.

13. Verlaine was about to return to his second teaching position in England, this one at Bournemouth.

## IV.

[Hôpital Tenon] July 28, 1887<sup>14</sup>

My dear Vanier:

Herein find enclosed a "boulangeade" for *Amour*.<sup>15</sup> Put it in after the Louise Michel ballad. I had already sent this chef-d'œuvre to Thomas,<sup>16</sup> with a request that he hand it to you. The tiresome idiot never answers me and never comes near me. But knowing him as I do, I trust him completely. Did he bring you the portraits and the hat? I have just given the last touches to J. M. de Hérédia, King of sonnet writers, and I'm beginning Ponchon. Later, Theuriet, Lemoyne, Lafenestre (I lack citations for these last four).<sup>17</sup> If we can get some real documents about them, all the better. Besides, I can stuff in theories of my own and some anecdotes.

They give me some vague hopes, here; but no matter, guard that writing table of mine for me, just the same.<sup>18</sup>

A long piece for *Amour* under way; je ferai suivre quelques Lucien Létinois très clairs.<sup>19</sup> You'll see that from now until the time we go to press the book will be as big as *Sagesse*.—*Parallèlement's* turn to be enlarged will come next.—No. IX of *Bonheur* is coming along swimmingly.<sup>20</sup> I'll send you "Hérédia" by Tellier, if he

14. Other correspondence of Verlaine's at this time indicates that this letter is correctly dated by the translator, but that there is an error in the address, which he gives thus: "Hospital Verron, Argand Gallery, Room 5, Bed 13." Actually, at this time in August 1887, Verlaine was in the Hôpital Tenon (which the translator probably misread as "Verron"). The Argand Gallery was not in Tenon at all, but formed part of the Asile National de Vincennes, where Verlaine went on his discharge from Tenon on August 9, 1877. The translator notes that the Argand Gallery address was added on a separate slip and it is possible that the latter was joined to the letter by Vanier in a moment of carelessness. For Verlaine's hospital stays, see the chronological table in Jean Richer, *Paul Verlaine* (Paris: Seghers, 1953), pp. 78-79.

15. This poem was probably "Gais et contents" (dedicated to Charles Vesseron), which bears the date "Juillet 1887," in *Amour* in the *œuvres poétiques complètes*. The poem which now follows the ballad to Louise Michel in *Amour* is "Sur la mort de Louis II de Bavière," but this poem had been composed a year earlier, as is indicated by a letter from Verlaine to Edouard Dujardin of July 6, 1886 (*Corr.*, III, 124-25). Verlaine was notably fond of juggling the order of his poems before their publication in volume form.

16. Edmond Thomas, to whom a poem in *Dédicaces* is addressed.

17. Biographies of Hérédia, Ponchon, Theuriet, Lemoyne and Lafenestre appeared in *Les Hommes d'aujourd'hui*.

18. There are numerous references in Verlaine's correspondence for 1887 and 1888 to this *secrétaire*, which was a kind of writing desk and storage box in which Verlaine kept his MSS. On Verlaine's departure from the Hôtel du Midi, in the Cour Saint-François, he left his belongings with the proprietor, Chanzy; Vanier had apparently gotten the *secrétaire* from him between the time Verlaine left the hotel on April 15, 1887, and the date of this letter.

19. The translator read this phrase as "je ferai cuire quelques Lucien Létinois" and provided a somewhat fanciful translation; the reading, however, is clearly "suivre." The phrase *très clairs*, which Verlaine apparently underlined in his letter, is intriguing. Can it mean that Verlaine's relationship with Létinois was not so platonic as some of his biographers have made it out? Or, on the other hand, does it confirm them in their view? The "long piece" for *Amour* is difficult to identify. It may be "Angelus de midi," first published in *La Revue Indépendante* for October 1887.

20. This is probably "L'Homme pauvre de cœur," which later became no. VIII of *Bonheur*. H. Bouillane de Lacoste in his critical edition of *Bonheur* (Paris: Mercure de France, 1949), indicates that Verlaine originally considered this poem as no. IX of the volume and that the manuscript bears the termination date of "2 août." "Bon Pauvre," originally no. VIII and presently no. IX of the volume, was also completed in August 1887, but the exact date is not known.

comes Sunday.—What about those *Maudits*? See Régamey for the portrait of Rimbaud. The photographs are at Carjat's—there are two kinds.<sup>21</sup>—Photographs of Hérédia also probably at Carjat's.—For *Maudits*, Régamey—the reproduction (?) of the etching of the heads of Aman Jean.<sup>22</sup> We could get some curious Mallarmé's and Villiers and M. Desbordes-Valmore would surely let us have some miniatures of his mother. Forain has a very amusing photograph of me (235 Faubourg St. Honoré?).<sup>23</sup>—As soon as I can get out a bit, with some decent clothes and a few louis in my pocket, I can do all these errands, which it might be well to put off meantime.

I think of going to Vincennes Tuesday.<sup>24</sup>—You will be advised in time. But how I wish I could have those pants! If I don't get them pretty soon, I'll be going about naked. I'm racking my brain to think where they can be. I didn't give you but one package—of mss.—did I, when I came out of Vincennes?<sup>25</sup> Not another one, in which the pants might be? But I don't think I did. They must be at Michel's, at G. I'll write and see. Otherwise, I'm afraid poor Hérédia will go and buy another pair in their place for fr. 3. 50, if there are any at that price. O! Holy Misery! O! Madame Delporte! O! Father Mauté!<sup>26</sup>

I say! you will look out for that writing desk of mine! *Expectant* the realization of my vague hopes and the 900 francs from the lawyer from the Ardennes!<sup>27</sup>

Excuse this writing paper and this pencil (it's yours), and this style of correspondence; and believe me always

your P. V.

P. S. I wrote to Dujardin, making an *advance a sine qua non* for the publication of

21. These photographs were the two which Carjat made of Rimbaud in October and December 1871, the only photographs from this period of Rimbaud's career. Verlaine wanted Régamey to illustrate the second edition of *Les Poètes maudits* and seems to have intended either that he use one of the Carjat photographs as the basis of his portrait or that he should rework an already existing portrait of Rimbaud by Régamey himself. Verlaine mentions such a portrait in Letter VI of the present series, to Régamey; see below, n. 59. The second edition of *Les Poètes maudits*, however, was not illustrated by Régamey, but by Luque, who did indeed model his medallion of Rimbaud on the earlier of these two photographs.

22. The translator had difficulties here, as indicated by his question mark after "reproduction" and the fact that the proper name is rendered only as "Am . . . Je . . ." I have been unable to locate any portrait of Rimbaud by Aman Jean; if one exists or existed, it must have been based on a photograph of Rimbaud, for Aman Jean was only eleven years old at the time of Rimbaud's appearance in Paris. At all events, no iconographer of Rimbaud mentions such a study. It is possible, of course, that the phrase may refer to a head of Verlaine himself, but here too we come to a standstill. Aman Jean did indeed execute a famous portrait of Verlaine, now in the Musée de Metz, but it dates from 1892. Again, no iconographer of Verlaine mentions any earlier portrait by this artist.

23. Photographs of these writers were also to be used as starting-points for their portraits in the second edition of *Les Poètes maudits*. Luque's medallion of Verlaine as "Pauvre Lélian" was based on a photograph by Allévy (Van Bever and Monda, *Bibliographie et iconographie de Paul Verlaine* [Paris: Messein, 1926], p. 216).

24. He did not actually go to the Asile National de Vincennes until a week later than he expected, that is, August 9, and not August 2 (Jean Richer, *Verlaine*, pp. 78-79).

25. Verlaine is referring to his first departure from Vincennes, about July 11.

26. Madame Delporte was of course Verlaine's estranged wife, who had remarried in 1886, and Mauté was her father. Verlaine blamed these two particularly for his predicament in the last years of his life.

27. This sum keeps recurring in Verlaine's letters of 1887-88. Nine hundred francs were coming to him from the sale of the farm he owned with the Létinois family at Juniville and constituted a "dépot de garantie de solde," to use the French legal term. The money was not due quite as soon as Verlaine hoped, however, for the payment date was April 1888. The lawyer he refers to is Maître Carrette.

the story in his *Revue*.<sup>28</sup> Je lui touche un mot about the hand-written advertisements, giving the lie squarely to Kahn's insinuations (the address of the latter, if you please).<sup>29</sup>

I'm writing some short tales, as well as this story, and also *Memoirs of a Widower*.<sup>30</sup> By the way, in *Le Bon Larron*, I've written the wrong name of the man, which ought to be effaced. *Cléophas* never was the good nor the bad thief. It's *Gestas* and *Dimas* that those fellows were called. But which one was the good thief? Try to find out and put the right name in the place of the usurper Cleophas!<sup>31</sup>

Bring me the *brouillon* of the novel just begun entitled *Conte de fée*, or *Pour ma fille*.—Bring me also, won't you, the copy and proofs of *Deux Mots d'une fille*.<sup>32</sup> Where can I (illegible). It's rather *lesté*. I've seen Baju again; also (illegible). And *Amour*—when do we start on that?<sup>33</sup>—Do you think I could dye black the borders of the sleeves of my green overcoat? When I get rich, I mean, of course! And after that?

28. This probably is *Charles Husson*, which appeared in fragmentary form in Dujardin's *Revue Indépendante* for December 26, 1888, as *Rampo*. It did not appear in volume form until the publication of Verlaine's *Oeuvres posthumes* (Vanier, 1903), where it formed part of the section called *Nouvelles*. In the second edition of the *Oeuvres posthumes* (Messein, 1913), the title *Nouvelles* was changed to the original title Verlaine had given some short pieces, *Histoires comme ça*.

29. In a letter to Gustave Kahn, dated August 1887 (*Corr.*, III, 187-89), Verlaine says: "Il paraît que vous avez vu dans la rue Tronchet (on a dit Tronchet) une ou deux affiches à la main avec mon nom dedans, qu'on recommandait pour des besognes. Je suppose bien que vous n'avez pas cru un instant que je fusse pour quelque chose dans cette 'publicité.' Farce détestable ou 'service' cru rendu, je me perds en conjectures, à propos d'une telle . . . 'lunerie.'" I have not succeeded in discovering any further details about this curious affair, nor do I know to what "insinuations" of Kahn's Verlaine is referring. The translator of this letter had difficulty with the phrasing here and rendered Verlaine's "affiches à la main" as "advertisements to hand."

30. At this time Verlaine was projecting a series of short sketches to be called *Nouveaux Mémoires d'un veuf*. The original *Mémoires* had been published in 1886 and the first mention of a continuation comes in a letter of Verlaine to Vanier of May 10, 1887 (*Corr.*, II, 75). The short tales he mentions were probably designed either for these new *Mémoires* or for one of the other volumes he had in mind, such as *Histoires comme ça*.

31. *Le Bon Larron*, a short reflection on a drawing by Willette, was originally designated by Verlaine as part of the *Nouveaux Mémoires d'un veuf*. It was first published in *Le Chat noir* on February 2, 1889, and appears in the most recent edition of the *Oeuvres posthumes* ([Messein, 1922], pp. 314-15) as the last section of *Souvenirs*. The name of the good thief was not changed, either in *Le Chat noir* or in the *Oeuvres posthumes*, and still appears as *Cléophas*, who in fact was the disciple to whom Christ appeared on the road to Emmaus; *Dimas* was the good thief. The MS of *Le Bon Larron* is now in the Salem collection, but offers little interest since it contains no corrections or revisions. The translator of the letter again made an error here. He read: "I've written the *real* name of the man," which of course is in direct contradiction to what Verlaine says in the rest of the paragraph.

32. *Deux mots d'une fille*, an autobiographical tale based on Verlaine's liaison with Marie Gamber, the Princesse Roukine of *Parallèlement*, was never published separately and did not appear until the publication of the *Oeuvres posthumes*, where it is now the first of the *Histoires comme ça*. Van Bever and Monda do not mention *Deux mots d'une fille* in their bibliography of Verlaine, and François Montel in his *Bibliographie de Paul Verlaine* (Paris: Librairie de la Bibliothèque Nationale, 1924) says only that it was "de 1888" (p. 78). This letter indicates that the actual date of composition was several months to a year earlier than that. *Conte de fée* appeared in *La Revue Indépendante* for March 19, 1888, again in *La Vie Populaire* for May 1891, and now forms part of *Histoires comme ça* in the *Oeuvres posthumes*.

33. *Amour* was finally published in April 1888, though it was announced in the *Journal de la Librairie* for March 26.

At any rate, look out for my writing desk!!  
We have hardly 15 days more—3 weeks!

## V.

[Hôpital Broussais, January 16, 1888]<sup>34</sup>

My dear Vanier:

Yes indeed, we'll sign it *Paul Verlaine*—why not? Proofs well corrected, you know!

I'm not going to be timid any more—about anything. And so, as soon as I get out (when? they must have told you—your clerk—that I had as you might say, signed a new lease, since the new doctors have undertaken to continue my cure)—as soon as I get out, I say—or before, especially if you will only come and pay me some long calls—I'm first going to begin, or rather continue, work on *Les Uns et les autres*; have the *saynète* copied by the people *ad hoc*, and send it or present it à l'Odéon or Français. Because, once again, why not? I'm also going to work on *Madame Aubin* (for the Gymnase or Vaudeville)<sup>35</sup>—don't know whether I will lengthen it or not—probably will; to do that I'll need a copy of *Louise*.<sup>36</sup> (By the way, are you going to present my artillery friend at Nancy<sup>37</sup> with a copy of the *Mémoirs*?) (You know that, outside of my own reasons for it—books in a regiment—they circulate a lot and are a good advertisement, especially in a crack regiment).

When the Rimbaud thing comes out,<sup>38</sup> send a copy, please, to M. Ernest Delahaye, 20, rue Oberkampf, here in town. Delahaye is one of my best and closest friends, and also an intimate friend of Rimbaud's since childhood. It was through the latter that I knew him first, away back in the old days at Charleville. I have, down there, a lot of curious notes and things about him, for a preface to his *Works*,<sup>39</sup> if there is to be a preface.

Send also to M. Charles Vesserer "au Petit Ardennais," Charleville, Ardennes. Lastly, send me, or rather bring yourself, three or four of the colored numbers to send "au pays."<sup>40</sup>

Read and re-read the Lemaitre article. Not bad in its way, but he could have written more and better!<sup>41</sup> Raynaud ought to do an article for the *Figaro* and let me

34. In the translation the address of this letter is simply "Paris" and the date is given as January 16, 1886. The description of a letter of Verlaine's to Léo d'Orfer (*Corr.*, III, 379), indicates that he was in the Hôpital Broussais on January 16, 1888. There is ample evidence in the letter to indicate that while the day is correctly given as January 16 (the reference to *La Petite Revue*, for instance), the year is actually 1888 (Lemaitre's article, the affair of Décadisme and so on).

35. Verlaine's idea of playing *Les Uns et les autres* and *Madame Aubin* did not come to fruition.

36. *Louise Leclercq*, of which *Madame Aubin* is a part.

37. Probably François Waltz, mentioned in a letter to Vanier of February 24, 1887 (*Corr.*, II, 70).

38. Rimbaud's biography in *Les Hommes d'aujourd'hui*; the fascicle bears the date of January 17, 1888 (*Corr.*, III, 134, n. 1). It contained a "portrait-charge" of Rimbaud by Luque based on the same Carjat photograph of October 1871, which served as model for his portrait of Rimbaud in the second edition of *Les Poètes maudits*. Some of *Les Hommes d'aujourd'hui* had colored portraits, others were in black and white.

39. Verlaine's edition of Rimbaud's *Poésies complètes* did not appear until 1895.

40. Verlaine is referring to Rimbaud's biography in *Les Hommes d'aujourd'hui*.

41. Lemaitre's article, "M. Paul Verlaine et les poètes symbolistes et décadents," appeared in *La Revue Bleue*, 3rd ser., XV (January 7, 1888), 2-14.

look it over before he sends it in.<sup>42</sup> I shall thank Lemaitre in one of my *fine* letters, but with reservations of my own, you can be sure!! You, yourself, hurry up and thank him too, and congratulate him on his ribbon (got a card of thanks from Mérat à propos).<sup>43</sup>

The *Petite Revue* might at least have printed my ballad—in which, by the way, we must use “maîtresse” in the envoi (“tristesse” is already in one of the stanzas)—with a little more solemnity.<sup>44</sup> But—to go on!

In case you can’t come Thursday (but you will, won’t you?), have sent to me the second number of the *Décadent*, the one which contains the letter which has brought me so many other letters in answer—“compromise,” “camaraderie,” “weakness,” “condescension,” “galvaudage,” “Baju joking,” “position to sustain” and all that!<sup>45</sup> What do I say? Why, let’s print Baju among *Those Men* at once!<sup>46</sup>—Baju writes me that he hasn’t a copy left to send me, all gone, sold! Where can this tempestuous number be found for me? Tempestuous—because? Well! Let’s talk of something else.

*Papier timbré, tous manuscrits!*<sup>47</sup> and if you come Thursday ask at the office of Triollet<sup>48</sup> at the Economy to allow you to remain until four o’clock for business matters—all mss.—we’ll fight also—contracts—don’t you bloody well forget!

We’re working, we are! An André Lemoyne is under way (for the *Hommes*, what

42. Raynaud did reply to Lemaitre on Verlaine’s behalf, but not in *Le Figaro*. His very aggressive article, “M. J. Lemaitre et les poètes décadents,” appeared in *Le Décadent*, 2nd ser., III, (February 15, 1888), 5-7.

43. Albert Mérat had just been decorated and Verlaine had sent him a note of congratulation, as he indicates in a letter to Vanier of January 5, 1888 (*Corr.*, II, 124).

44. *La Petite Revue de Littérature et d’Art* published Verlaine’s “Ballade à propos de deux ormeaux qu’il avait” (now in *Amour*) in January 1888. The poem is not accompanied by any introduction or commentary, and it is to this lack which Verlaine probably objects in this letter. In *La Petite Revue* the third line of the envoi reads: “Gaité, santé, bon vin, tristesse,” while in the *Oeuvres poétiques complètes* (ed. Le Dantec [Gallimard, 1951], p. 292) it is: “Gaité, santé que rien ne blesse.” In the notes to *Amour* Le Dantec indicates these variants for the line: “Gaité, santé, bon vin (tristesse) maîtresse” (p. 1000).

45. This sentence refers to the affair of Décadisme. In *Le Décadent* (II, 1 [December 15, 1887]) Baju published Verlaine’s “Ballade pour les décadents,” and in the next number (II, 2 [January 1, 1888]), the famous *Lettre au Décadent*, in which Verlaine seemed to take a position as head of the Décadent wing of the new school of poetry and to set himself up in opposition to the Symbolistes. In the following number (II, 3 [January 15, 1888]), Baju published a letter of his own in which he described Verlaine’s letter as a “déclaration de principes” and established him as a *chef d’école*. The number containing Verlaine’s *Lettre* was printed in 10,000 copies, instead of the usual 4500. Verlaine, though perhaps secretly pleased by the stir his declaration made, wrote Baju on January 10, 1888: “De plus, je ne reçois décidément pas le journal, ce qui m’empêche nécessairement de juger de la polémique d’un journal qui prétend s’autoriser d’une lettre mienne qu’on intitule pompeusement *Déclaration de principes*—et ce qui n’est pas gentil, surtout moi étant où je suis” (*Corr.*, III, 25).

46. Whatever Verlaine’s feelings about the *Déclaration de principes*, it is evident that he immediately recognized the commercial possibilities opened up by the affair and intended to capitalize on them as soon as possible. It is only fair to add, however, that he had been urging Vanier for some months before this time to publish Baju’s biography in *Les Hommes d’aujourd’hui*, but again perhaps because he sensed the sales value that the growing tension between the Symbolistes and the Décadents might mean for him. Baju’s biography still had not appeared in February 1888, as is indicated by a letter of Verlaine to Vanier (*Corr.*, II, 142).

47. Verlaine is probably referring to the manuscripts of *Amour* and *Bonheur*, for which he wanted to sign contracts as soon as possible. The phrase “papiers timbrés et tous manuscrits” appears in a letter to Vanier of January 8, 1888, (*Corr.*, II, 127) and the same idea is expressed in two other letters of the same period, January 20, 1888 and “fin janvier” (II, 130, 133).

48. Triollet was the director of the Hôpital Broussais.

a cruel play of words!). Get me his bibliography and details about his employment in the bookshop. Just received a letter of thanks from Hannon, and his *Joyous Rhymes*.<sup>49</sup> Going to answer him. Will speak to him about Rops for the *Parallèlement*,<sup>50</sup> for which I have some stunning ideas—will speak to you, later, about them. You must see the thing I've got in hand to add! Needless to state that it is not at all 'parallel' to a very different *of course* for *Bonheur* (don't forget that ms. either, will you?)

As to the *Maudits*, I'm going to write to Forain.<sup>51</sup> I'll write also to Félix Régamey, but about the Rimbaud *Œuvres*.<sup>52</sup> According to the answers we get, or the lack of them, we can act.

Until Thursday, then, or whatever near (very near!!) day you may wish or be able to come,

Vostre amy tout dévouë  
P. Verlaine

P.S. Got also a very patient letter from Eddy Lévis in answer to my congratulations on his *Elaine*.<sup>53</sup>

—Also have a Theuriet on the stocks.<sup>54</sup> That'll be about all the poets we can swallow. What'll we do with these biographies, "l'un des jours," as they say at Coulommiers?

—I'm thinking all the time of Louis XVII<sup>55</sup>—and Sarah Bernhardt<sup>56</sup>—and "la maréchale" Booth<sup>57</sup>—and Paulus<sup>58</sup>—and *rigolettes* biographies!

49. Théodore Hannon, editor of *L'Artiste* (Brussels) and author of *Rimes de joie*. There is a notice of a letter to Hannon, dated December 29, 1887, in which Verlaine congratulates Hannon on his verses (*Corr.*, III, 374-75).

50. Vanier intended to publish *Parallèlement* in 1888 and got the idea of commissioning Félicien Rops to do an engraving for the volume. On January 5, 1888 Verlaine wrote Rops to ask him to do the frontispiece (*Corr.*, III, 313-14) and on February 11, 1888 thanked him for agreeing to the proposal (pp. 314-15). Van Bever says that Armand Lods possessed a letter from Rops, dated July 1888, in which he indicated that he had already finished the frontispiece (p. 313, n. 1). But for unknown reasons Rops finally declined to let his engraving appear in the volume, as is indicated by a letter of Verlaine's (written for him by Cazals) of December 11, 1888: "Rops, vu aussi, ne peut rien faire actuellement pour *Parallèlement*. Il nous faut donc refaire le traité" (II, 341). *Parallèlement* appeared unillustrated.

51. Between July 1887 and January 1888 Verlaine had apparently decided that Forain, not Régamey, should illustrate the second edition of *Les Poètes maudits*, but Forain refused, as Verlaine indicates in a letter to Vanier of February, 1888 (*Corr.*, II, 141); Verlaine had sent him photographs of Rimbaud and himself to be engraved. Luque replaced Forain as illustrator.

52. For details, see below, n. 59.

53. Charles Donos in *Verlaine intime* (Paris: Vanier, 1898) reproduces a letter of Verlaine's dated December 27, 1887 thanking Lévis (whose name was Eddy) for *Elaine* (p. 164).

54. A biography of André Theuriet by Verlaine appeared in *Les Hommes d'aujourd'hui*.

55. There are numerous references to a work on Louis XVII in Verlaine's correspondence. It is mentioned as a project in a letter to Léo d'Orfer, October 23, 1886 (*Corr.*, III, 262). In a letter to Cazals of September 2, 1889 he says that the work will be finished by winter (III, 70), but on October 31, 1895 in a letter to Robert de Montesquiou he notes that only the first part is finished (III, 240). On December 9, 1894 Verlaine claimed from Théo de Bellefond, owner of the Café Procope, the pages of a fragment of manuscript dealing with Louis XVII; Eugénie Krantz had apparently torn these pages badly (II, 331, n. 1). Nothing is known of the final disposition of this MS.

56. Verlaine either hoped to have her play Louis XVII (see his letter to Léo d'Orfer, October 23, 1886 [*Corr.*, III, 262]) or planned to write a biography of her for *Les Hommes d'aujourd'hui*, in which prominent women occasionally appeared. The latter hypothesis is supported by Verlaine's reference to "la maréchale" Booth in this letter.

57. Around 1885-90 the Salvation Army was making a strong campaign in France, publishing numerous books and a newspaper, *En Avant!*, from its headquarters in Paris. "La maré-

## VI. LETTER TO FÉLIX RÉGAMÉY

A few lines of the following letter, addressed to one of Verlaine's oldest and most faithful friends, were published by Régamey in his *Verlaine dessinateur* ([Paris: Flourey, 1896], p. 21).

Paris, le 19 janvier 1888

Mon cher Régamey,

Nous nous proposons, Vanier et moi, de faire une édition des vers et des poèmes en prose de Rimbaud. Vanier me dit que tu avais conservé de belles études d'après la tête de Rimbaud et qu'il avait été question entre vous d'un portrait frontispice pour ladite édition.<sup>59</sup> Qu'en dis-tu et si—de l'avis de Vanier qui est archi-consistant—tu venais me parler ici, au bout du monde, mais il y a des tramways Montrouge. C'est—naturellement, à l'hôpital Broussais, salle Follin, lit 22, rue Didot 96.—14<sup>e</sup> arrond.—Oui, nous parlerons de cela et aussi du portrait mien à la plume fait pendant le siège, tu te souviens, pas, toi—un petit véritable chef-d'œuvre:<sup>60</sup> il est chez ma femme (remariée avec tous les sacrements de la R. F. et qui s'appelle Delporte gros comme le bras). J'ignore l'adresse de la gonzesse, mais son avoué qui l'a et peut la donner, demeure 12, rue Vivienne, c'est un maître Guyot-Simonnest. Il me serait bien agréable de l'avoir reproduit par toi en tête de quelqu'un de mes bouquins ou dans mes *Poètes maudits*, qui vont paraître un des jours.<sup>61</sup> Toi tu pourrais sans doute obtenir sans débat cet objet qui est nôtre et non pas sien à c'te belle grosse . . .<sup>62</sup> Enfin nous nous verrons, pas?

L'important, pour l'instant, c'est le Rimbe et heureusement il est entre tes mains.

A un de ces jours, bientôt j'espère. En ce Broussais. Public admis de 1 à 3 les jeudis et les dimanches. D'ailleurs, je suis comme on dit dans mes entours, "en

---

chale" Booth to whom Verlaine refers here was the daughter of the founder of the Salvation Army, William Booth; both father and daughter used the title of marshal. It is probable that Verlaine also wished to write a biography of her for *Les Hommes d'aujourd'hui*.

58. Paulus was the stage name of Jean-Paul Harans (1845-1908), a famous singer who made popular the songs "En r'venant de la revue" and "Le Père la Victoire," was very successful during the Boulangist period. Verlaine apparently knew him, for he refers to him in a letter to Vanier of July 19, 1887 (*Corr.*, II, 88-89), as "ce futur interlocuteur." It is not clear why Verlaine mentions him here; it is probable, however, that he either expected some favor from him or planned to write him up as one of *Les Hommes d'aujourd'hui*.

59. When Verlaine's edition of Rimbaud's *Poésies complètes* appeared in 1895 it contained two sketches of Rimbaud by Verlaine, but no portrait by Régamey. I have been unable to locate any portraits of Rimbaud by Régamey, save two made in London in 1872. One shows him drooping in a chair; the other depicts him and Verlaine strolling together, looking very bohemian.

60. This portrait, dated "29 sept. 1870, Café du Gaz, Paris étant assiégié," is reproduced in Félix Régamey, *Verlaine dessinateur* (Paris: Flourey, 1896), p. 19, and in François Ruchon, *Verlaine: Documents iconographiques* (Vésenaz-Genève: Cailler, 1947), no. XX. In Verlaine's *Epigrammes* there is a quatrain entitled "Au bas d'un portrait (Siège de Paris)" which refers to this portrait:

Paul Verlaine (Félix Régamey pingebat)  
Muet, inattentif aux choses de la rue,  
Digère, cependant qu'au lointain on se bat,  
Sa ration de lard et son quart de morue.

61. So far as I can determine, no portrait by Régamey was ever used as frontispiece for any of Verlaine's volumes. *Les Poètes maudits* were illustrated by Luque, as indicated above.

62. No words are omitted from the text here; the blank is Verlaine's.

chérurerie," nulle incommodité infectueuse ni emmerdement d'aucune sorte à redouter.

Et je t'attends impatiemment ou réponse.<sup>63</sup>

Ton

P. Verlaine

### VII. LETTER TO A STAFF MEMBER OF *Le Figaro*

The following letter was written at a time when Verlaine was evidently more desperate than usual to obtain money, perhaps because his treatment at the Hôpital Saint-Louis was costing him six francs a day. Several letters of May and June 1894 show him writing with a kind of desperate urgency to various newspapers and magazines to collect for pieces they had printed.

Le 6 juin 1894

Monsieur et cher confrère,<sup>64</sup>

Pardon d'encore vous déranger, mais je ne savais pas hier que paraîtrait quelque chose de moi au *Figaro* ce matin!

Il s'agit d'une poésie en musique, "O triste, triste était mon âme!" paroles de M. Verlaine, musique de M. Logé.<sup>65</sup>

Est-ce au *Figaro* ou chez Messrs Ricordi<sup>66</sup> que j'ai à toucher?

J'enverrai chercher la réponse demain vers 6 heures de l'après-midi, au *Figaro*.

Excusez-moi encore une fois je suis si embarrassé, impotent et "comme prisonnier" que je suis!

Agréez mes bien sincères cordialités.

P. Verlaine

Hôpl. St. Louis, Pavillon Gabrielle, chambre 2

63. On February 3, 1888 (*Corr.*, II, 135-36), Verlaine says he has had a reply to this letter, but does not indicate whether or not Régamey accepted the propositions.

64. I have been unable to identify this "confrère" of Verlaine's. It may have been Victor Tissot, for Verlaine told Robert de Montesquiou that Eugénie Krantz knew Tissot (letter of May 18, 1894 [*Corr.*, III, 227]) and it was probably Eugénie whom Verlaine sent to collect from *Le Figaro*.

65. This famous poem of *Romances sans paroles* had previously been set to music by Charles Bordes (François Porché: *Verlaine tel qu'il fut* [Paris: Flammarion, 1933], p. 273, n. 1.)

66. G. Ricordi et Cie. were music publishers and the song was published in *Le Figaro* by arrangement with them.

## REVIEWS

*A Critical Bibliography of French Literature.* Edited by D. C. Cabeen. Vol. II: *The Sixteenth Century*, edited by Alexander H. Schutz. Syracuse, N. Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1956. Pp. xxxii + 365.

Anyone who has ever attempted to establish a bibliography of a single author knows that the difficulties of such a task are great enough to dishearten all but the most courageous. The time when a single scholar could compile even a non-critical bibliography like that of Lanson is probably gone forever. In this day and age only a team of patient and daring specialists can be expected to undertake a reasoned survey of the entire critical literature of one country.

It is with deep gratitude and admiration that we acknowledge this latest volume in the great and unique project headed by David C. Cabeen. The entire *Critical Bibliography of French Literature* will comprise six volumes. Vol. I (*The Medieval Period*) was published in 1947, followed by an enlarged edition in 1952. Vol. IV (*The Eighteenth Century*) appeared in the same year. The present volume is dedicated to Robert V. Merrill, under whose editorship it was begun and who, unfortunately, did not live to see the fruits of his labors in book form.

The difficulties in finding a fair classification are enormous and perhaps greater for the sixteenth century than for any other period of French literature. In general one can agree with the eighteen main headings selected by the editors. They range from "Background Materials" (Chapter I) to "The Relations of the French Renaissance with Foreign Literatures" (Chapter XVIII). One may take exception, however, to a medley of entries in some sections of Chapter XVII entitled "Translators." Here no logical principle seems to have been adopted. Many entries belong to other chapters. The entries having to do with George Buchanan (nos. 2476-78) should have followed no. 2324 in the section on Latin plays. Andrea Alciati's *Livret des emblemes* (no. 2465) would be more appropriate after no. 510, along with nos. 2466-71. G. P. Maffei's *L'Histoire des Indes* (no. 2496) should be classified under "Geography, Exploration and Travel." Erasmus is represented here by one of his least important works, *La Civilité morale des enfans* (no. 2486), followed by the hardly enlightening comment "An essay on education of upperclass children." Bernard Palissy, Ambroise Paré, and Olivier de Serres are found now in Chapter XI ("Writers on Religion"), now in Chapter XIII ("Technical Writers"). Several entries are simply duplicated in the two chapters. Other items are entered without any justification in either one chapter or the other. If, however, such a duplication was necessary, nos. 2168-71 should have been found in Chapter XI instead of Chapter XIII, since they are directly concerned with the reformed religion which Bernard Palissy practiced.

The General Editor states that "there has been no effort to eliminate duplicate titles" (p. x). When important works like the *Dictionnaire des lettres françaises* or Renaudet's *Préréforme et humanisme* are entered twice or even three times, one can only agree with such a policy. But sometimes duplication does not serve any purpose. H. Franchet's article on Erasmus and Ronsard (no. 1120), for instance, is correctly classified under Ronsard, but we do not expect to find the same article again in the chapter on Franco-Dutch relations simply because Erasmus was born in Holland. If authors are classified according to their place of birth, many problems arise. Marnix de Saint-Aldégonde wrote in Flemish and French; to place him under "The Low Countries" would certainly be much more justified than to do so with Erasmus. The case of the latter is so much easier, since he never wrote in any language but Latin and Greek.

Here and there, other improvements could be made. Whenever there exists a bibliography of a certain author or literary movement, that entry should precede all others in the section. Thus, S. A. Tannenbaum's bibliography of Montaigne (no. 1754), which the contributor calls an "indispensable volume despite minor defects," would be more handy after the list of editions than among the criticisms of Montaigne under the letter *T*.

One of the most valuable features of this volume is its selective and critical approach. And, as one would expect, most of the critical notices are excellent. There are, however, many insignificant or useless comments. The reader who wishes to know the value of W. von Wartburg's *Evolution et structure de la langue française* (no. 615) finds a long quotation from the book itself: he learns that it is intended for "les gens cultivés qui voudraient s'informer sur les grandes lignes de l'évolution de la langue française sans s'égarter dans les broussaillages d'une terminologie spéciale." This is followed only by the remark: "Brief treatment; author well fulfills avowed purpose." What the reader really wishes to know is how the chapter on the sixteenth century treats the questions of language and style that arose during that period. In the same chapter, W. Schoenfelder's *Die Wortstellung in den poetischen Werken Pierre de Ronsards* (no. 602) is followed by a comment that tells us nothing about the book or its value: "Since 1905 the production of studies of this type has declined noticeably in favor of studies covering a broader field and attempting to discern the course of syntactical evolution." The French translation of Raymond Sébond's *Liber creaturarum* (no. 2503) is appraised thus: "One of the greatest works on natural theology before 17th century. Important for Montaigne students." Here, the question arises: for whom is this critical bibliography intended? A reader for whom such a comment is useful is not likely to consult this work. Nor will the Cabeen ever be opened by anyone who needs to be told that Sir Thomas More's *La Description de l' Isle d'Utopie* (no. 2500) is a "Famous socialist treatise of English Chancellor; important for all studies of government and for its great popularity and literary influence."

Some notices fall short of proper standards of objectivity. To dismiss one of the best introductions to the history of the entire century, Hauser and Renaudet's *Les Débuts de l'âge moderne* (no. 158) as a "respectable presentation" is not only inadequate but unfair. Lucien Febvre is another historian who does not fare too well. His great work on Luther (no. 163), the result of many years of original research, receives an appraisal of decent length which concludes with the following remark: "Original but typically French viewpoint." What this means is far from clear. Is it "French" to hide one's scholarly training and to write so as to be understood universally? How might Michelet's *Mémoires de Luther* have been judged?

The more personal a judgment, the more care should be taken to include reviews, if possible, from a variety of periodicals, in order to help the reader form his own opinion. It would not have been difficult to list reviews of such important works as Erich Auerbach's *Mimesis* (no. 1511), A. M. Schmidt's *La Poésie scientifique en France au seizième siècle* (no. 327), or E. Mann's *Erasmus et les débuts de la réforme française* (no. 2893). It would be advisable for all contributors to the next edition of this work (and to future volumes) to adopt a common policy. Each contributor should not decide for himself whether or not to include reviews. The number of reviews for each entry varies from none to seven. There are no reviews for nos. 614, 618, 867, 1735, 1770, 2335, 2418, 2522 and 2571—to mention just a few works chosen at random. In the case of Henri Bremond's *Histoire du sentiment religieux* (no. 156), a single review is listed, that of the contributor himself. There is nothing reprehensible, of course, in mentioning one's own review, but this one is merely a summary, not a critical appraisal, and it appeared twenty years after the first volume of Bremond's work.

It may be unfair to ask the editors why some works were included, and others left out. Every scholar's *fichier* contains titles which he will no doubt miss in this *Critical Bibliography*. Although readers will understand that this volume is selective and that the omissions are calculated, certain ones, however, will appear unexplainable. Here are a few titles which beg for inclusion: Villey's *Les Sources d'idées au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1912) which contains important selections of Chappuys, Belleforest and Vigenère that cannot easily be found elsewhere. There should have been room for P. Morphos' edition of the dialogues of Guy de Brués (Baltimore, 1953) and B. W. Bates' text of Louis Le Roy's *De la vicissitude ou vanité des choses en l'univers* (Princeton, 1944). We sorely miss Paul O. Kristeller's definitive work *The Philosophy of Marsilio Ficino* (New York, 1943), available also in Italian translation (Florence, 1953). It is not true that Giuseppe Saitta's *La Filosofia di Marsilio Ficino* (no. 2488) is the "Only substantial full length account." Had Wiley's and Will's yearly "Survey of Recent Literature of the Renaissance" (*Studies in Philology*) been used systematically, many an article and book published by American scholars would have appeared here. In the section on "Periodicals" we should have liked to see

the *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme*, for many years the only periodical exclusively devoted to the sixteenth century. Its ninety-odd volumes contain hundreds of articles of interest. May we also plead for the inclusion in this section of *Comparative Literature and Renaissance News* (the latter now in its ninth year)? We shall thank our English colleagues by adding their useful *Year's Work in Modern Languages*. Since it is impossible to list all the important contemporary sources like Crespin's *Livre des Martyrs* or *La Satyre Ménippée*, the problem might have been solved by including at least the four volumes of Hauser's indispensable *Les Sources de l'histoire de France. Partie II: Le XVI<sup>e</sup> Siècle* (Paris, 1906-15). A revised edition, in a badly needed chapter on "Education," will, we feel certain, have room for Abel Lefranc's *Histoire du Collège de France* (Paris, 1893). Another surprising omission is George Ascoli's *La Grande Bretagne devant l'opinion française [ . . . ] jusqu'à la fin du XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle* (*Travaux et Mémoires des Facultés de Lille*, 1927).

Some sections are too inclusive; the ones on medicine and mathematics, are definitely too long. An effort seems to have been made to find the "first book" on a particular subject. Johann Bauhin's *Traité des animaux aians ailes qui nuisent par leur piqueures ou morsures, avec les remedes* (no. 366) is mentioned as the "earliest entomological study in French." There is an entry for Guillaume Du Puis' *Phlebotomie artificielle* (no. 434) which is "the first specialized treatise in French on bleeding". We find François Rousset's *Traité nouveau de l'hysteromotokie ou enfantement cesarien* (no. 453), "the earliest treatise in French on the cæsarean operation." Most of us could probably do without such listings. We could also dispense with this quotation from Scheifley's "The Father of French Agriculture" (on Olivier de Serres): "many a breeder of our time would do well to read his discussion of the care of horses, cattle, sheep, hogs and poultry" (no. 2192). References to some basic works on medicine, natural science, agriculture, etc., would have been sufficient here. But since rare, highly technical books were listed, it would have been useful to the specialized reader to have library locations for them, as he now has for nos. 1827 and 1833.

One wonders about the editors' policy concerning the immense Latin literature of the sixteenth century. Selections and omissions seem to be the work of chance. Gaguin's works are included, but not Guillaume Budé's *De asse*, *De philologia*, or *De transitu Hellenismi ad Christianismum*, all basic in the question of Christian humanism. When a humanist published a work in both Latin and French, both editions should have been included. How useful it would have been to have entries for Erasmus' works followed at least by the most important of their French translations. (The same could profitably have been done for Budé, Justus Lipsius, Cornelius Agrippa, Estienne Dolet, Juan Luis Vives, Pierre de La Ramée, and De Thou). For Du Plessis-Mornay's *De la vérité chrétienne* (no. 2004) both the

Latin and the French are listed. But for Jean de Serres (no. 2245) only the Latin is given.

The next edition of this bibliography should have a chapter on "The Influence and Fortunes of Latin and Greek authors." (The appendix containing a useful list of translations from Greek should be incorporated into the text). Some works in this area are mentioned, but many equally important ones are left out. Marie Delcourt's *Etude sur les traductions des tragiques grecques et latins en France depuis la Renaissance* is rightly included but not Lebègue's "Les Traductions françaises pendant la Renaissance" (*Actes du Congrès de Strasbourg, Association Guillaume Budé* [Paris, 1939], pp. 362-77); neither do we find his equally important "L'Humanisme latin de la Renaissance" (*Mémorial des études latines* [...] offert [...] à J. Marouzeau [Paris, 1943], pp. 270-84). K. Boehm's work on Seneca appears but not Bossuat's "Les Traductions françaises des Commentaires de César à la fin du XV<sup>e</sup> siècle" (*Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance*, III [1943], 252-411).

The same uneven treatment can be noticed in the section on translations from modern languages. Leone Ebreo's *Dialoghi d'amore* should have been mentioned at least in the Pontus de Tyard version, and Diego de Dan Pedro's *Carcel de amor* in Herberay des Essart's rendering. We should also have become acquainted with Le Fevre de La Boderie's translation of Ficino's *De religione christiana* as well as with various works of Louis Le Roy and Louis Meigret.

Despite some shortcomings—unavoidable in an undertaking of such nature—there cannot be any doubt that the *Critical Bibliography* is a great achievement. No scholar in the field, young or old, can do without this guide. Are there many scholarly works to which such a statement would apply?

*Columbia University*

DANIEL F. PENHAM

*La Crédation poétique au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle en France de Maurice Scève à Agrippa d'Aubigné.* Par Henri Weber. Paris: Librairie Nizet, 1956. 2 vols. Pp. 774.

Henri Weber's remarkable study takes its appropriate place beside a number of distinguished volumes that preceded it in the field of French Renaissance poetry—those of Henri Chamard, Paul Laumonier, Joseph Vianey, Pierre de Nolhac, Gustave Cohen, Marcel Raymond, Raymond Lebègue, V. L. Saulnier, and others too numerous to mention. One cannot bestow higher praise upon the new work than to say that it is worthy of its predecessors. It comes opportunely to gather together the results of their inquiries, but because it is concerned primarily with the nature of the creative process in poetry, and because esthetic interpretation occupies so prominent a place in its pages, M. Weber's work is less positively informa-

tive than its forerunners. It is, however, a well-informed work, and thanks to the critical insight of its author, it is often a very illuminating one.

Within its province is included most of the significant poetry of the French Renaissance. The highly organized, though not entirely faultless, economy of M. Weber's research is determined by the intellectual, social, and historical environment in which this poetry came into being. The first three chapters constitute the broad introduction to the inquiry. Chapter I deals with the main intellectual currents of the period; Chapter II is devoted to the social condition of the poets; Chapter III treats of the poetic theories that arose in response to the influences and the needs of this time yet often succeeded in transcending time. In particular, the third chapter examines the theoretical relationship between inspiration and imitation, between the creative impulse in all its immediate urgency, on the one hand, and on the other, responsiveness to a tradition that had its origins in remote antiquity. Beyond the three introductory chapters, the theme of M. Weber's book is, in large measure, the manner and the extent to which the seemingly antithetical positions adopted by the theorists were reconciled by the poets, who were, in the most striking instances, the same individuals. The author's plan gives him an opportunity to analyze with care the work of Maurice Scève, Jacques Peletier, the poets of the *Pléiade* and of its adherents, Guillaume du Bartas, and Agrippa d'Aubigné.

In view of the immense vogue of love poetry, derived from Petrarch and his Italian imitators, that swept France in the latter half of the sixteenth century, M. Weber devotes his fourth chapter to Maurice Scève's *Délie*, the first poetic sequence in France written exclusively, in imitation of the Italian *canzonieri*, to celebrate the love of a lady. The following chapter, as one might anticipate, discusses the love poetry of the *Pléiade* and of its adherents, each of whom wrote sequences to a real or imagined mistress: Ronsard to Cassandre, Du Bellay to Olive, Baïf to Francine. . . .

This arrangement is not without certain inconveniences. It tends to create the impression that Scève mediated between the Italians and the poets of the *Pléiade*, an impression that is not minimized by M. Weber's frequent comparisons between the *Délie* and the later French sequences. In reality, Scève stands apart in spirit and in form both from the Italian Petrarchists and their French disciples. He was justly admired, but hardly imitated, by the *Pléiade*, who wisely refrained from adopting the *dizain*, the sole verse form, with the exception of the single prefatory *huitain*, that occurs in the *Délie*, and who undoubtedly went directly to the Italians for much of the substance and tone of their love poetry.

Another awkward result of M. Weber's design is the neglect of Clément Marot, who, much more than Scève, was a true herald of the *Pléiade*. The author is aware of this neglect, but easily reconciles himself to it: "En prenant pour point de départ la *Délie* de Maurice Scève, nous avons éliminé l'œuvre de Marot, de Marguerite de Navarre et des petits poètes d'une

verve populaire [...] c'est que, malgré tout, l'époque fervente et bouillonnante des débuts de l'Humanisme ne trouve pas sa meilleure expression dans la forme poétique encore trop raide et trop sèche" (p. 8). Strange reason for brushing aside the gentle, diverse, and gracious Marot!

A third and even more serious consequence is M. Weber's relative neglect of the ode. This is particularly regrettable in the case of Ronsard, who had already published five books of odes before he turned his hand to the writing of his first love sequence.

The inevitable impression that emerges is that French poetry of the sixteenth century was preponderantly based upon Petrarch and his followers. But in reality, the poetry of Greek and Roman antiquity was the more influential in determining the form and content of French Renaissance poetry. M. Weber is by no means unaware of this, but his work as a whole does not advance this position as clearly as his concluding observation, in which the true literary relationships are reestablished: "Elle [la poésie française] participe au mouvement général de la Renaissance par son attachement aux sources antiques et plus particulièrement grecques de la poésie [...] et enfin par l'imitation très précise de la poésie italienne" (p. 735).

French poetry of the century of Dorat, Budé, the Estienne family, of Ronsard, Du Bellay, Belleau, and countless others, laid the foundation of the ensuing classical period. The influence of this development in European literature is as immeasurable as the fact of its presence is a commonplace of criticism and scholarship. One is therefore surprised to read, "Il serait faux de croire [...] que l'évolution même de Ronsard soit une évolution vers le classicisme" (p. 160). In spite of the fundamental differences between the literature of the two centuries, there is no evolutionary hiatus between them. I would venture to repeat what I have said in these pages (XLV [1954], 200), that it is possible to define "Ronsard's evolution as a progression from a Marotian to a Malherbian orientation, of such a nature that the first was never entirely obliterated while the second was never fully attained." Eventually M. Weber adopts the only position that the data will support: "En effet, si les *Discours* [1562-63] de Ronsard atteignent déjà dans le détail cette clarté et ce mouvement équilibré qui seront la caractéristique de la tragédie classique et plus précisément de la tragédie cornélienne, ils témoignent dans leur structure d'une diversité plus tumultueuse" (p. 599). Elsewhere he sees "dans [les corrections] de 1578 [...] l'évolution vers un goût plus classique et plus dépouillé" (p. 393).

Once these necessary reservations have been made, it is pleasant to pay tribute to a book in which there is so much that is admirable. I have already indicated the nature of its central research. M. Weber formulates it at once: "le point de départ de notre étude est donc le paradoxe d'une création à travers une imitation" (p. 7). Interesting questions spring from this paradox. How does a poetic theory frankly based on imitation guar-

antee the individuality of those who subscribe to it? In virtue of what quality or principle does imitation become creation? What is the relationship between the imitation of nature and literary imitation? How is tradition transmuted to vision? What is personal and national originality in literature and in art?

Literary imitation is itself not an undifferentiated activity. At its least interesting level, says M. Weber, "l'imitation n'est, comme dans beaucoup des sonnets de Du Bellay, qu'une école de rédaction, où s'acquiert la clarté et la sobriété, mais au dépens de toute émotion sincère" (p. 307). Sometimes, however, it is in this moment of redaction, apparently so detached and neutral, that the creative impulse surprises and most powerfully guides the poet's pen: "Nous pouvons ainsi constater, dans un des plus beaux sonnets de *L'Olive* [“*Deja la nuit en son parc amassoit*”], comment la création se développe, non pas à partir d'un sentiment directement éprouvé, mais à partir d'images suggérées par un texte littéraire" (p. 306). These two processes are, of course, perfectly conciliable, and it is this circumstance that gives imitation its greatest sanction. The literary text that the poet imitates, even unconsciously, is capable of tapping the subtlest springs of his personal experience, of revealing and organizing unsuspected technical faculties solicited by the united attraction of that experience and of the given poetic form.

Thus imitation, which seems at first glance an evasion of artistic responsibility, may become the instrument that liberates the personal vision of the poet. He would be rash indeed who would attempt, except dialectically, to distinguish, within this phase of the artist's experience, between imitation and inspiration, between the gift of originality and the gift of tradition: "Dans la reconnaissance simultanée de la valeur de l'inspiration et du principe de l'imitation, se manifeste la double exigence d'une authenticité individuelle et d'un recours à la tradition littéraire. La valeur créatrice de l'émotion est ainsi jugée inséparable de l'effort d'assimilation du métier poétique" (p. 159).

This analysis of the basic research that underlies M. Weber's thesis would be incomplete if it failed to show how the poet of the French Renaissance, spontaneously responsive to a European tradition of which he was the beneficiary, became in turn a benefactor and a creator of the national tradition. One of the author's constant efforts is to show how each of the poets sought to impress upon his borrowed materials not simply the seal of his personal originality, but that of the generic originality of his country, so that the artist, when most himself, was most French: "Les traits nationaux apparaissent [...] dans certaines qualités formelles qui sont le reflet d'un tempérament: une mesure et une discréption de l'émotion qui n'exclut point [...] une certaine chaleur oratoire, un sens rigoureux de la construction architecturale" (pp. 737-38). Success did not always crown this endeavor—sometimes the occasion was unhappily chosen, the materials refractory,

the motives at war with the Muse. But the poetry of the French Renaissance emerged victorious from the *gageure* implicit in M. Weber's paradox. In a book that is noteworthy for its many valid and beautifully expressed judgments, one cannot but admire how, at the conclusion of the research, the entire investigation is brilliantly summarized, and the initial paradox triumphantly resolved: "Mais souvent, l'imitation permet de conquérir les moyens d'expression les plus propres à la poésie, de rendre plus subtilement et plus fidèlement le mouvement et la couleur de la vie, comme aussi de rattacher le frémissement de l'instant vécu à la continuité humaine que fixe la tradition littéraire."

*University of Connecticut*

ISIDORE SILVER

*Liberales y románticos: Una emigración española en Inglaterra (1823-1834).*  
Por Vicente Lloréns Castillo. México: El Colegio de México, 1954. Pp.  
382.

El Sr. Lloréns, profesor de Princeton, ha elegido como tema de sus investigaciones uno de los períodos más estériles en todos los órdenes de la historia de España: la década que sigue a la entrada en el país de las tropas del Duque de Angulema para terminar, por acuerdo de la Santa Alianza, con el precario constitucionalismo español. Años de increíble despotismo y de emigración en masa de cuantos espíritus ilustrados o simplemente liberales pudieron escapar a tiempo del terror imperante.

Pocos historiadores o críticos se han sentido atraídos por una época conocida en los manuales con la denominación de "década ominosa." Y, a pesar de ello, se trata, como Lloréns demuestra, de un momento lleno de incógnitas y problemas de honda significación para la historia del liberalismo español y aún del europeo.

No estamos, sin embargo, ante una obra de historia política, sino ante uno de los mejores estudios de historia literaria que hemos leído en los últimos años. Señálemos, por de pronto, dos aciertos iniciales, relacionados con la elección del tema: el haber ido a buscar los orígenes del romanticismo español donde había que buscarlos, entre los emigrados; y el haber tenido la visión—claramente expresada en el título, "Liberales y románticos"—de que política y literatura eran rigurosamente inseparables por exigencias de la coyuntura histórica. Los emigrados encarnarían la única continuidad posible de la cultura española en aquel tremendo vacío creado por la tiranía y, literariamente, vendrían a entroncar, quizás sin darse enteramente cuenta de ello, con algunas muestras de sensibilidad pre-romántica visibles en escritores de una generación anterior vinculados al neoclasicismo oficial y a la ilustración: Cadalso, Jovellanos, Meléndez Valdés, Cienfuegos, ecos muy débiles, pero significativos, de nuevos rumbos truncados por las sacudidas de las guerras napoleónicas.

Lloréns ha tenido la conciencia, además, de algo esencial y que quizás

no se ha subrayado lo suficiente: cómo la confluencia entre lo político y lo literario es una de las innovaciones básicas del espíritu romántico, desde los rebeldes del *Sturm und Drang* hasta el arquetipo del escritor "patriota" o simple combatiente por la libertad, existente en todas las literaturas europeas,—Byron, Hugo, Mickiewicz, Espronceda, etc. España no podía substraerse al fenómeno porque el destino de su literatura ha estado determinado, desde entonces y aun desde antes (recuérdese el caso de Jovellanos), por la resistencia de un gran sector de los grupos dirigentes a toda innovación política. Y así, cada nuevo movimiento literario—romanticismo, el realismo con Galdós, el 98 y lo que sigue—ha tenido que empezar por plantearse el problema de la realidad histórica del país: de su tradición y de sus posibilidades futuras. Lloréns sabe muy bien todo esto y, aun ciñéndose al tema con exemplar mesura, el libro, independientemente de su valor crítico y erudito, viene a iluminar zonas profundas del ser histórico de España, a lo cual no debe de ser del todo ajena la condición de su autor, ciudadano de otra emigración, en la que, *mutatis mutandis*, se reproducen, casi siglo y medio más tarde, muchas de las circunstancias.

Era necesario recordar algo de lo dicho para situar la obra en una perspectiva adecuada. No debe pensarse que se trata de un ensayo interpretativo más. Por el contrario, es éste un libro concebido con el máximo rigor intelectual, sin una sola generalización y escrupulosamente documentado. Cuanto hemos sugerido queda en el trasfondo. Lloréns deja que el lector saque sus propias consecuencias y si a veces generaliza es siempre con moderación evidente. Así cuando, al referirse al papel que el liberalismo español juega frente a la Santa Alianza, apunta:

Un singular destino parece dirigir la historia española a contratiempo de la europea. Tolerante en la Edad Media, cuando el fanatismo domina en otras partes; intolerante en la Moderna, cuando surge en Europa el libre examen: oscurantista, cuando los demás ilustrados. En el siglo XIX España dió en ser liberal cuando la reacción absolutista trataba de sofocar en el continente el menor brote revolucionario. La España constitucional de 1820, cuya trayectoria tiene no pocas semejanzas con la España republicana de 1931, inició su existencia del modo más pacífico y jubiloso para acabar en una guerra civil y ser víctima de la intervención extranjera (pág. 13).

Queda enmarcado con precisión el momento histórico e insinuado el sino adverso de una emigración que, por ir a contrapelo de la reacción dominante en Europa, estaba necesariamente condenada al fracaso.

Después de resumir en el capítulo primero los antecedentes históricos desde la vuelta de Fernando VII, dedica el segundo y tercero a reconstruir la "vida de los refugiados en Londres" y su adaptación al nuevo medio: "Impresiones de Inglaterra." Son páginas que, pese al tono objetivo característico de la obra, se leen con interés sostenido. Se estudia en ellas desde el carácter y procedencia de los emigrados, cuyo número se calcula en "poco

más de mil familias," hasta las maneras muy diversas cómo cada uno fué reconstruyendo su vida. Lo histórico adquiere frecuentes tonos noveloscos y hasta dramáticos en las semblanzas escuetas de los componentes de este grupo humano donde abundan los ejemplares del pintoresco individualismo español: guerrilleros que llegaron a ser militares eminentes como Espoz y Mina; héroes y mártires de la libertad como "Chapalangarra" o la noble figura de Torrijos, y entre los que no faltaba la siniestra, como el franciscano Nébot, "El Fraile"; representantes del clero ilustrado que tan importante papel había desempeñado en los comienzos del liberalismo y en las Cortes de Cádiz como los hermanos Villanueva o el bondadoso don Miguel del Riego, hermano de Rafael y protector de Ugo Foscolo también emigrado, al igual que otros italianos, en Londres; eruditos raros como el Doctor Puigblanch, polemista capaz de llegar al fanatismo en defensa de una etimología; científicos como Bauzá y La Gasca; comerciantes como Istúriz y Mendizábal; políticos y economistas como Calatrava, que se ganó la vida de zapatero, Canga Argüelles o Flórez Estrada; artesanos como Patilla y toreros como "Muselina". Casi todos están individualizados con una frase o por una anécdota escogida con tino. Recreado está también el ambiente de Somers Town, convertido por unos años en barrio español. Y se nos hace sentir el patetismo de la emigración en las charlas interminables y sin objeto de las tertulias del British Coffee Shop o al recordar cómo Carlyle en su *Life of John Sterling* evocó "las trágicas figuras de los refugiados en Londres, paseando en grupos los días de primavera por Euston Square y las cercanías de la iglesia de San Pancracio, con un aire grave, los labios cerrados, envueltos con altiva dignidad en sus capas raídas. Unos ya encanecidos, otros con cabellos negros de un negro profundo, aquellos hombres de tez morena y oscura mirada de fuego, en su desambular sin objeto le producían al escritor inglés la impresión de leones enjaulados" (pág. 36). O podría citarse también el párrafo en el que se proyectan las sombras de Teresa y Espronceda al recordar una escena doméstica de las hijas del coronel Mancha bordando para auxiliar su indigencia (pág. 54).

Lloréns logra, en forma admirable, dar vida a la historia, sin efectismo alguno y sin desviarse de su propósito de recrear el fondo de una olvidada y, sin embargo, significativa época de la literatura española.

En el capítulo cuarto se resumen las actividades políticas y, como parte de ellas, el apoyo de figuras salientes en la vida inglesa como los "apóstoles" de Cambridge, Sterling, Trench, Tennyson, Kemble y las relaciones con otros emigrados como los italianos en Londres o los españoles en París; la preparación de expediciones y el fracaso de todas ellas, destacándose la de Espoz y Mina y la de Torrijos, de cuyo fusilamiento en Málaga se da una estampa impresionante por su sobriedad.

Junto a los hechos históricos se analizan las varias empresas culturales que los emigrados inician o estimulan. A ellas se debe, más que a nada, el desarrollo del hispanismo en Inglaterra, impulsado, en parte, por el favo-

rable reflejo de las nuevas orientaciones románticas nacidas en Alemania y por la creación de la historia literaria como disciplina. Enseñanza, traducciones, publicaciones de obras eruditas tales como el *Romancero* de Depping, la *Gramática* de Nebrija, o algunas colecciones de poesía. A la difusión del libro contribuye la labor de bibliógrafos, editores y libreros, entre los cuales sobresale Vicente Salvá, cuyo *Catálogo* constituye todavía hoy un repertorio bibliográfico valioso. Hispanistas como Lord Holland, Wiffen y John Bowring colaboran con los emigrados o les ayudan de diversas maneras. Importante es también la labor de divulgación por medio de libros, revistas o almanaques destinados especialmente al lector hispanoamericano. En este aspecto son, por ejemplo, característicos los "Catecismos" de Ackermann, de los que dice Lloréns: "La influencia educativa de aquellos modestos manuales difundidos por los más remotos lugares de Hispanoamérica no ha sido estudiada" (pág. 143), y merecería serlo, podríamos añadir.

Todo lo hasta aquí sumariamente comentado ocupa aproximadamente la mitad del libro, los cinco primeros capítulos. Podría decirse que corresponde—aunque todo esté bien integrado—a la primera parte del título: "Liberales." El enfoque del resto va más hacia lo literario y correspondería así a la segunda: "Románticos." En ella se empieza por estudiar a las figuras que iban a convertirse diez años más tarde en los escritores románticos de mayor relieve. Rivas—cuyo viraje hacia la nueva sensibilidad se opera en la travesía de Gibraltar a Inglaterra que le inspira los poemas "Super flumina", "A las estrellas" y "El desterrado"—y el joven Espronceda que en Londres e imitando a poetas ingleses encuentra—tras sus ensayos juveniles de "El Pelayo", revisado también en la capital inglesa—el rumbo de su obra futura. Junto a Rivas y Espronceda, escritores de menor cuantía, de los que un lector no especializado apenas recordaría sino el nombre—Florán, Urcullu, Mendibil, Seoane, Gorostiza, Valentín Llanos, etc.—contribuyen a dar fisonomía al momento y participan, en algún modo, en la gestación de las nuevas corrientes.

Una de las aportaciones fundamentales de Lloréns es el estudio de las publicaciones periódicas: revistas, almanaques, etc. Se sabía, o más bien se sospechaba, la importancia de las revistas de los emigrados. Rara vez dejaba de aludirse a ellas al tratar de los orígenes del Romanticismo. Peers y algún otro erudito las habían utilizado en parte, pero la verdad es que nadie las había analizado con la minuciosidad, el cuidado y, sobre todo, con el seguro criterio discriminatorio que lo hace ahora Lloréns. Con razón apunta que si a los diversos periódicos de la nueva emigración se unen las *Variedades* de Blanco White y el *Repertorio Americano* de Andrés Bello, "no parecerá exagerado decir teniendo en cuenta las publicaciones no periódicas de españoles y americanos, que las circunstancias históricas convirtieron a Londres, entre 1824 y 1828, en el centro intelectual de España y aun de Hispanoamérica" (pág. 243).

Aunque no se trata estrictamente de un periódico, puede tomarse como

ejemplo del método de Lloréns y de los resultados por él obtenidos el análisis de los *No me olvides* de Mora y Mendibil respectivamente. Allí van apareciendo, entre otras muestras de la literatura de transición hacia un romanticismo aun sin cuajar, "la historia pasional de una joven suicida, un cuento fantástico alemán, una leyenda de Oriente, y un cuento de asunto medieval" procedentes del *Forget Me Not* de 1825, modelo de su gemelo español (pág. 199). Hay otras cosas de mayor substancia: "El alcázar de Sevilla", prosa de Blanco; páginas de teoría literaria donde se defiende lo natural y fantástico; la nota sentimental, exotismo, cosmopolitismo popularizante romántico. Refiriéndose concretamente al *No me olvides* de 1825, se dice que "merece . . . ocupar un puesto nada desdeñable en los orígenes del romanticismo español, cuyo primer núcleo se encuentra entre los emigrados de Londres" (pág. 203).

Con la literatura de los emigrados en la capital inglesa nace también el costumbrismo español del siglo XIX, cuando en la Península Mesonero y Larra—los dos únicos escritores que pueden salvarse en la desoladora esterilidad de estos años—apenas han hecho acto de presencia. Y hasta puede encontrarse una incipiente forma novelesca del "episodio nacional" en la combinación del elemento costumbrista con el histórico en las narraciones de Valentín Llano (V. págs. 220-21).

De mayor interés, si cabe, es la colaboración de algunos emigrados en las grandes revistas inglesas—*Blackwood's Magazine*, *Quarterly Review*, *Westminster Review*, *Edinburgh Review*, *The Athenaeum*, etc.—reconstruida aquí pacientemente tras una labor casi detectivesca. Y no deja de causar asombro hoy especialmente, época de otra emigración dispersa e inasimilada, cómo algunos de estos españoles pudieron en pocos años adquirir el suficiente dominio de la lengua para poder ganar, en muchos casos, el respeto de sus colegas ingleses. Realizaron así una obra de difusión de algunos valores de la literatura española que debió de dar no poco impulso al hispanismo naciente. Pero no se limitaron a eso. Terciaron también en el comentario de nuevas ideas estéticas y en las polémicas sobre nuevas orientaciones políticas. Hecho tanto más significativo y paradójico por no ser infrecuente que en un momento de crisis del liberalismo fueran estos representantes de un pueblo pretendidamente oscurantista quienes mantuvieran casi solos la bandera de la libertad en la gran contienda entablada en Europa entre la Revolución y la Restauración. "España fué entonces"—comenta con razón el autor—"como volvió a serlo más tarde, piedra de toque" (pág. 293).

Es necesario mencionar todavía cómo en este vasto panorama de hechos y referencias, de reconstrucción de una época, ha sabido el autor revalorar a cuatro escritores que, sin llegar a ser grandes figuras, merecen desde luego atención mayor de la que hasta ahora se les había concedido:—Trueba y Cosío, aparte de ser el primer cultivador español de la novela histórica, como ya sabíamos, estrenó con éxito en el teatro inglés, y en algunos fragmentos, reproducidos por Lloréns, de su novela *The Incognito*

muestra un talento singular como costumbrista (véase la deliciosa descripción de un café madrileño en las págs. 229-31);—José Joaquín de Mora, activísimo asalariado de la pluma, hombre de múltiples empresas y escritor de muchos géneros, en casi todos los cuales se destaca sobre el nivel común, no demasiado alto en rigor;—Alcalá Galiano, el de mayor talento político y literario, que para lograrse plenamente quizás hubiera necesitado circunstancias más propicias; y por encima de todos, José María Blanco, emigrado desde el año 10, maestro, inspirador y guía a pesar de su apartamiento.

En cierto sentido podría decirse que el libro es una reivindicación de estas figuras y muy particularmente de la de Blanco White, al que aparte de muchas referencias, se le dedica casi todo el último capítulo: "La Emigración y el Romanticismo." Sale de él indudablemente engrandecido y, no vacilaríamos en decirlo, como el español de mayor conciencia intelectual entre Jovellanos y Larra. De su vida nos dice Lloréns que fué de "una permanente insatisfacción" y de su artículo "Spain" publicado en la *Quarterly Review* que "constituye quizás el ensayo de interpretación más original escrito con anterioridad a la generación del 98" (pág. 288). La superioridad de Blanco no se ve únicamente en la profundidad de su pensamiento histórico, sino también en la captación de la nueva sensibilidad literaria. Tan sólo Alcalá Galiano se le aproxima.

El libro encierra muchas enseñanzas de toda índole, cuyo comentario rebasaría los límites de una reseña. Sus resultados, aun descontando infinitas sugerencias, son sumamente significativos. Destacaremos sólo tres de ellos:

Primero. Si bien se trata de una cuestión marginal, son importantes los datos e inferencias sobre las relaciones entre los emigrados e Hispanoamérica, y deberían tenerse en cuenta por quien intente hacer la historia intelectual de la América de habla española.

Segundo. Se aclara un aspecto de los orígenes del romanticismo, al que la crítica rutinaria no ha prestado la suficiente atención: las insistentes llamadas a buscar inspiración en modelos ingleses, abandonando los franceses—que en este momento se identifican con las supervivencias del neoclasicismo. La nueva orientación se anuncia, por ejemplo, a fines del siglo XVIII, en el anglicismo creciente de Jovellanos; la fomenta ya francamente Blanco White; la repiten con mayor o menor convicción varios emigrados y culmina en el prólogo de Alcalá Galiano a *El Moro expósito*. El que más tarde fuera de nuevo la influencia francesa la que llegase a predominar no le resta significación.

Tercero, y a nuestro juicio, capital, queda prefigurado el *fracaso* inevitable del Romanticismo español y penetrantemente analizadas sus causas. En la base de todas ellas estará la imposibilidad de resolver el conflicto entre el liberalismo y el tradicionalismo reaccionario que ya Böhl de Faber había identificado con lo romántico algunos años antes; o, dicho de otra manera, la imposibilidad de reconciliar el catolicismo español con las nuevas corrientes del pensamiento y la sensibilidad europeos. Cualquiera que haya meditado aunque sea someramente sobre la cultura española

desde el Romanticismo a nuestros días sabe lo que significa esa constante preocupación que tan agudamente sintieron los emigrados de "unir, no enfrentar, lo tradicional y lo moderno, lo español y lo europeo" (pág. 357).\*

Convendría añadir que la utilidad del libro no se limita ni a los interesados en interpretaciones históricas ni a los especialistas en literatura española. El erudito, por ejemplo, encontrará en él acopio importante de datos; y el estudioso de literatura general, junto a un método seguro en la reconstrucción de una época, un número considerable de hechos de repercusión europea, interpretados con ejemplar discernimiento. Y no estaría de más afirmar que una obra como la de Lloréns, hecha a conciencia y con sentido moderno, debiera hacernos pensar en la conveniencia de revisar el concepto de "historia literaria", disciplina hoy quizás excesivamente desacreditada.

*Columbia University*

ÁNGEL DEL RÍO

*La Musique et les lettres au temps du Romantisme.* Par Léon Guichard. (Université de Grenoble. Publications de la Faculté des Lettres, v. 12) Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1955. Pp. 424.

*Les Romantiques et la musique: Le Cas George Sand, 1804-1838.* Par Thérèse Marix-Spire. Paris: Nouvelles Éditions Latines, 1955. Pp. 711.

Le livre de M. Léon Guichard s'ouvre sur un vigoureux plaidoyer: s'adressant tout ensemble aux musicologues et aux historiens de la littérature, il les invite à abattre les cloisons étanches qui séparent encore leurs disciplines. "Depuis les chansons de geste, dont la déclamation chantante était soutenue d'un instrument, jusqu'au *Christophe Colomb* de Claudel et Milhaud, jusqu'aux mélodies composées par Francis Poulenc sur les poèmes d'Apollinaire et de Louise de Vilmorin," tout, selon l'auteur, appelle "des études, et une revue, de littérature et de musique rapprochées" (pp. 5-6). Les quelques travaux de valeur qui existent dans ce domaine ne rendent que plus regrettable à ses yeux l'absence d'un organisme coordinateur; l'absence d'un périodique qui accueillerait ce genre de recherches; l'absence de manuels qui, pour chaque grande époque, établiraient la suite des rapports entre la musique et les lettres. Là-dessus, M. Guichard s'attaque à la période dite romantique: simple sondage s'il faut en croire son excessive modestie,<sup>1</sup> mais sondage d'envergure puisqu'il s'étend à plus d'un demi-siècle (1789-1850).

\* A conclusiones parecidas llegó el autor de esta reseña examinando el problema desde otro punto de vista y fiándose más en la liquidación del romanticismo español que en sus orígenes. La coincidencia es, por tanto, altamente reveladora. Véase "Present Trends in the Conception and Criticism of Spanish Romanticism," *RR*, XXXIX (1948), 229-48. Cfr. especialmente pp. 239 y 240.

1. Je m'étonne, cependant, qu'il ne fasse pas un peu plus de crédit à la thèse de Raymond Leslie Evans sur *Les Romantiques français et la musique* (Paris: Champion, 1934). Il ne la mentionne qu'une fois—pour y relever une erreur! Elle mérite mieux à mon sens, et, pour incomplète ou incierta qu'en soit la documentation, se recommande par nombre de jugegements fins y nuances.

Mme Marix-Spire ne goûte guère davantage le présent état de choses. Elle se montre, il est vrai, dans son monumental ouvrage, beaucoup plus soucieuse d'épuiser le sujet de son choix que de tracer un programme aux érudits de l'avenir; mais elle prêche d'exemple, sur le mode voulu par M. Guichard,<sup>2</sup> et non sans asséner, chemin faisant, de rudes coups de boutoir à la critique d'hier. Son titre, ou plutôt ses titres,<sup>3</sup> indiquent assez qu'elle entend, au travers d'un "cas" typique, réviser un procès intenté au romantisme en général. Le ton de son introduction n'est pas d'un plaidoyer, mais d'un réquisitoire—contre ceux, et ils sont légion, qui, scrutant l'horizon par le petit bout de la lorgnette, font dater de l'ère baudelairienne et wagérienne l'alliance féconde de la musique et de la poésie. Sa défense des écrivains pré-baudelairiens ne va point sans une réhabilitation au moins partielle de la musique romantique elle-même, c'est-à-dire de la matière sur laquelle leur jugement était bien tenu de s'exercer. Trop avertie pour rompre des lances surannées en faveur de Rossini et de Meyerbeer, de la romance et du *bel canto*, Mme Marix-Spire se garde de les condamner absolument. Elle rehausse la stature de Liszt, à défaut de celle de Berlioz qui n'en a plus besoin;<sup>4</sup> elle souligne, avec juste raison, que les interprètes d'alors—vocalistes et instrumentistes—valaient bien, en nombre et en qualité, ceux qui les ont précédés ou suivis; elle rend hommage aux efforts de Habeneck, de Baillot, de Nourrit, de plusieurs autres, qui furent en France les enthousiastes introducteurs de Weber, de Mozart, de Schubert, de Beethoven. Formé à pareille école, le goût musical des romantiques ne pouvait être aussi nul qu'on s'obstine à le prétendre. De fait, par la vertu d'une "curiosité passionnée" qui compensait leurs erreurs et leur "culture incomplète," tous, ou presque tous, servirent magnifiquement la musique:

[. . .] mieux en un sens que les encyclopédistes, qui ne s'adressent jamais qu'à un public restreint; [. . .] mieux aussi que les symbolistes, qui restent essentiellement des artistes de chapelle, et voient avant tout dans la musique une admirable réussite, des procédés, des méthodes, des recettes capables de faire saisir la fluidité, les frissons les plus impalpables et mouvants de la vie du sentiment et de l'inconscient, toute une technique qu'il faut essayer de capturer, d'exploiter, pour faire de la poésie le premier des arts (p. 21).

Or, "le premier des arts, pour la majorité des écrivains romantiques qui l'adoraient sans autre fin qu'elle-même, c'est la musique, qui va leur dicter, mêlée à l'ivraie, et même chez les moins musiciens, Gautier par

2. Précisons sans plus tarder que l'ouvrage de Mme Marix-Spire est le premier des deux dans l'ordre du temps: il s'agit d'une thèse de doctorat d'Etat dont la soutenance remonte à 1951. Toutefois, le volume de M. Guichard était déjà sous presse lorsque cette thèse a paru en librairie.

3. Le titre donné en tête du présent compte-rendu est, en effet, celui de l'édition courante. Les "exemplaires de thèse" sont intitulés: sur la couverture, *George Sand et la musique*; sur la page de titre: *Les Romantiques et la musique: George Sand, 1804-1838*.

4. Mais elle observe au passage (p. 40)—c'est autant d'eau à son moulin—que Berlioz, méprisé des pontifes de la critique musicale, trouva ses meilleurs défenseurs parmi les écrivains.

exemple, des jugements si sûrs et si subtils que l'histoire de la musique ne les pourra négliger" (*ibid.*).

Et voilà la guerre allumée. Au tournant de ces propositions diverses, et de ces mutations de valeurs, la controverse nous guette. S'il est exact, comme j'augure, que, par-delà la matière dont ils traitent, par-delà leurs apports documentaires, l'intérêt de ces deux volumes gît dans la volonté d'élargir et de vivifier nos méthodes de recherche, l'entreprise vaut certes qu'on y applaudisse; mais elle vaut aussi qu'on prévoie de fortes résistances. L'histoire des ouvrages de l'esprit, depuis qu'elle aspire à entrer dans l'orbite des sciences, a connu une existence mouvementée; et ce n'est pas en multipliant ses ambitions qu'elle fera taire ses détracteurs.

Somme toute, nous assistons ici à une nouvelle offensive contre les abus et défauts de la spécialisation. L'un et l'autre auteur affirment sans ambages que les catégories actuelles ne sont plus de mise et que l'historien de demain, sous peine de continuer à fausser les perspectives, se devra d'avoir des lueurs de tout, comme on disait au Grand Siècle. Les temps sont proches, en vérité, où un émule de M. Guichard réclamera une revue de littérature et de peinture conjuguées. A merveille! et puisque les rêves ne coûtent rien, ne soyons pas timides; rêvons donc d'une "revue de synthèse comparative" qui, prenant les arts et la littérature pour base, les replacerait dans leur climat *humain*. Mais n'attendons pas qu'elle recueille d'emblée tous les suffrages. . . . Gageons plutôt qu'elle sera prise entre deux feux. Celui des techniciens d'abord, la plupart anti-humanistes par définition et trop attachés à leurs techniques pour admettre qu'on puisse impunément chevaucher plusieurs spécialités à la fois. Et, sur l'autre flanc, celui des super-humanistes, je veux dire des philosophes, esthéticiens et critiques purs, dont nous savons de reste qu'ils ne sont jamais tendres pour l'historien, l'accusant de cataloguer, de compiler, de prendre le dehors pour le dedans, l'accident pour la substance, et d'égratigner misérablement l'écorce des chefs-d'œuvre. C'est ainsi que la littérature comparée s'est vu reprocher, tantôt d'embrasser une pluralité de mondes, tantôt de n'êtreindre que le vide, et de présumer de son pouvoir dans les deux cas. Qu'elle tente de s'annexer l'histoire des arts, et les méfiances croîtront à proportion. Car enfin l'on veut bien consentir que le secret de l'œuvre littéraire, de tous le moins rebelle, se laisse pénétrer à la rigueur, flit-ce des amateurs, flit-ce des historiens, pourvu qu'ils justifient d'un peu de finesse et de goût. En revanche, ni la finesse ni le goût, même renforcés d'un imposant bagage de connaissances historiques, ne sont jugés suffisants pour apprécier un peintre ou un musicien. Peinture et musique, nous dit-on, sont des arts quasi hermétiques, des langages d'initiés, fermés au profane qui n'y saurait jamais trouver qu'un plaisir sensuel et affectif. La partie n'est donc pas censée être égale entre le musicologue qui s'arroge le droit de parler de Victor Hugo ou de Balzac, et l'historien de lettres mélomane, véritable romantique malgré lui si, d'aventure, pour déchiffrer Beethoven, il n'a rien que sa propre "curiosité passionnée".

On conçoit, je l'espère, que je ne prends pas ces objections à mon compte. Je suis, après tout, historien de métier: comme M. Guichard, comme Mme Marix-Spire, comme M. Jacques Barzun qui, hier encore (*The Energies of Art* [New York, 1956]), bravait la tempête et déclarait en substance: "C'est le moment historique qui fait les auteurs. C'est le moment historique qui fait les œuvres, qui transforme des vagues passagères en autant de cristallisations de la conscience humaine. Et c'est à l'histoire, seule capable de restituer ce moment, qu'il faut demander de comprendre et de juger". Hétérodoxe et minoritaire tant qu'on voudra, cette opinion est la mienne, par conviction intime, d'ailleurs, plus encore que par esprit de corps. Les réserves qu'il me reste à introduire seront donc des réserves d'historien, portant, non sur les prémisses des deux ouvrages que j'examine, mais sur telles ou telles de leurs conclusions.

Pour être transcrise à la hussarde, dans un style qu'il faut bien qualifier de négligé, l'enquête de M. Guichard ne manque assurément pas de conscience: à telle enseigne qu'elle a chance de demeurer longtemps un livre de référence et de chevet. Cette conscience, à son tour, suppose beaucoup de foi. Mais en quoi, exactement, M. Guichard a-t-il foi? Lisez-le, et vous vous apercevrez très vite qu'il a foi dans la vertu de certaines "constatations," même dubitatives, même négatives, bien plutôt que dans les richesses de son sujet. Il chasse pour l'honnête amour de chasser, d'explorer, et sans illusions excessives sur ce qu'il rapporte dans sa giberne. Si le découragement ne l'atteint point, c'est qu'il était d'avance résigné. Il savait, avant d'entreprendre son étude, que "la période romantique est, dans l'histoire de la musique française, une période creuse"; que "le grand romantisme musical, dans la musique d'orchestre, d'opéra, de piano ou de chant, est le romantisme étranger, et surtout allemand"; que "dans le nôtre, nous ne trouvons en rien—Berlioz à part—l'équivalent de notre romantisme littéraire" (p. 385). Dûment soupçonneux, dès l'abord, que les romantiques littéraires "ne comprenaient pas grand'chose" à la musique, il se console en réfléchissant que tous "s'y sont intéressés sous une forme ou sous une autre" (p. 386; c'est moi qui souligne). Et son cœur se réchauffe tant soit peu à la vue de Stendhal écoutant du Mozart, de Nerval murmurant de vieilles chansons dans la forêt d'Ermenonville, de George Sand en extase, tapie sous le piano de Liszt: "pour ces quelques justes, la période romantique méritait d'être sauvée" (p. 387). Sans doute; mais nous sommes loin de la ferveur rédemptrice qui, tout à l'heure, soulevait Mme Marix-Spire, et ce n'est pas un spectacle des plus édifiants que de voir ces deux érudits contemporains, également compétents et scrupuleux, également ou presque également sympathiques au romantisme, soucieux d'éviter les erreurs et partis-pris de leurs prédécesseurs, d'accord entre eux sur la procédure à suivre, se séparer nettement l'un de l'autre quand ils en viennent à évaluer le bilan de leur moisson.

Soyons juste. M. Guichard, tout comme Mme Marix-Spire, et du point de vue qui les occupe, place George Sand fort au-dessus de la gent littéraire

de son temps. C'est à ses yeux, par les goûts et l'éducation, une "véritable musicienne," qui nous a laissé, dans *Consuelo* (1842), "le roman de la grande musique et de l'interprétation musicale"; dans *Les Maîtres Sonneurs* (1853), "le roman de la musique populaire et de l'inspiration" (p. 374). Pareil jugement, les 700 pages de Mme Marix-Spire le ratifient et l'amplifient de mille manières: par anticipation, notons-le bien, puisque nous n'avons ici que le premier panneau d'un diptyque et que le développement s'arrête à 1838, c'est-à-dire à l'instant précis où George Sand va s'éprendre de Chopin—l'homme et l'artiste—and approfondir pour tout de bon sa connaissance du phénomène musical.

On ne saurait que s'incliner, perclus de révérence et d'admiration—*filled with awe*, dirait la langue anglaise—devant l'immensité d'un labeur que rien ne rebute, pas même la nécessité de creuser un tunnel de 700 pages pour arriver un jour au cœur du sujet. Si j'emploie le mot de "nécessité," c'est à bon escient, et pour bien faire entendre qu'il ne s'agit pas là d'une simple préface, qui, en tant que telle, serait outrageusement mesurée; et si j'emploie le mot de "tunnel," c'est à bon escient encore, car les démarches par où s'affine et s'affirme le goût musical de George Sand sont obscures et tortueuses plus souvent qu'à leur tour. Il fallait, à vrai dire, un extraordinaire mélange de patience et d'ardeur—les deux traits, précisément, qui distinguent cet ouvrage—pour suivre et ne pas enchevêtrer, comme il est advenu que George Sand l'enchevêtrât elle-même, le fil d'Ariane de sa formation. Il y fallait, avec une remarquable clarté d'esprit, ce que j'appellerai le sens de la vie—de la vie dans ses complexités et ses incohérences, avec ses chutes et ses remontées, avec ses aveuglements et ses illuminations. Aussi bien avons-nous là une biographie—la meilleure possible—de Lélia. Une biographie intérieure, vous l'entendez sans peine, non une biographie pittoresque, hollywoodienne, et la procession de ses amours; et pourtant, sur sa face externe, si touffue, si implacablement documentée, qu'elle ne nous fait grâce d'aucun détail jugé pertinent. C'est au jour le jour, ou peu s'en faut, que Mme Marix-Spire, à l'affût de ses matériaux, met ses pas et les nôtres dans les pas de George Sand. Parce qu'il est un "bilan musical" à extraire de tous les milieux qu'elle a traversés, rien ne sera laissé au hasard: on s'y plongera à fond, on les fouillera, on les pressera, on les videra de leur substantifique moelle. Ainsi en va-t-il de la chambre conjugale elle-même: la musique ne fut-elle pas une cause foncière de désunion entre Casimir Dudevant et sa femme? Ainsi en va-t-il des salons de La Châtre: le développement qui leur est consacré a la riche saveur d'une étude de mœurs provinciales, environ l'an 1830. Ainsi en va-t-il de l'Opéra et des Italiens, où, dès son arrivée à Paris, la jeune Aurore se rend "presque tous les soirs"—et Mme Marix-Spire avec elle. Je doute que personne ait jamais promené un regard plus aigu sur les coins et recoins de la "mansarde bleue," et, après avoir lu bien des travaux sur la Venise des romantiques, il me restait à connaître l'authentique Venise de

George Sand, "ville chantante" jusque dans le silence dont elle est baignée et qui l'emporte décidément—c'est de ma part une héroïque concession—sur la Venise de Chateaubriand. N'oublions pas non plus les solitudes rustiques du Berry, puisque les mille bruits de la nature sont musique aussi aux oreilles de la châtelaine de Nohant: elle les recueille partout dans son œuvre, et Mme Marix-Spire met en relief ces admirables notations auditives, si fréquemment enchâssées et dissimulées dans l'écrin d'un long passage que nombre d'entre elles, jusqu'ici, avaient échappé à des lecteurs moins attentifs.

Ce n'est pas tout. Les précisions extérieures, nous l'avons dit, ne représentent en l'espèce qu'un moyen vers une fin. Pour parvenir jusqu'à l'âme de George Sand, pour faire, la musique aidant, le point minutieux de son intellect et de sa sensibilité, il fallait, de toute évidence, remonter bien au-delà de son berceau. L'infatigable enquêteuse n'y manque point. A qui lui reprocherait un déterminisme trop rigoureux, et d'obéir trop complaisamment aux préceptes de M. Taine, elle répond en invoquant l'autorité de George Sand en personne. Dans *l'Histoire de ma vie*, celle-ci examine ce qui se passait un siècle avant sa naissance, et le moins que nous puissions faire est de l'imiter. Nous aurions même loisir d'aller plus haut et plus loin qu'elle ne s'y est résolue—and d'évoquer le fameux Hans-Christophe, grand-père d'Aurore de Koenigsmarck, ce condottiere nordique métamorphosé en membre de l'Académie de Suède, qui, sur la fin de ses jours, prenait fort au sérieux son titre de protecteur des sciences et des arts. C'est avec Aurore de Koenigsmarck, cependant, que se noue, pour ne plus se rompre, le fil de l'hérédité musicale. De la mère de Maurice de Saxe, la reine Ulrique-Éléonore se plaisait à dire qu'elle était "son rossignol". Sans être aussi doué qu'elle, le vainqueur de Fontenoy savait "les vertus rythmiques" de la musique, en appréciait "le rôle contagieux," et imagina de s'en servir pour relever, à la paix comme à la guerre, le moral de ses soldats. Avec sa fille, Marie-Aurore, la vocation ancestrale reparait de plus belle et s'allie à la vocation, non moins prononcée, de la famille Dupin-Francueil. George Sand n'a pas connu son grand-père paternel, violoniste amateur d'un certain talent, qui fabriquait lui-même ses violons et dont il semble bien qu'il ait collaboré au *Devin de Village* de Jean-Jacques Rousseau. On sait, en revanche, comme elle a reçu les leçons de sa grand-mère, qui lui faisait entendre des airs de Porpora, de Pergolese et de Durante et lui inculqua de bonne heure l'amour des vieux maîtres italiens. Et il y eut encore, pour confirmer la prédestination musicale du futur auteur de *Consuelo*, l'influence immédiate de son père, Maurice Dupin, militaire de carrière, fort brave sous le feu, mais la tête et le cœur si pleins de mélodies, que sa place eût été dans un orchestre bien plutôt qu'aux armées; celle, enfin, de sa mère, la plébéienne Sophie Delaborde, fille d'un maître oiseleur, et qui, sans connaître seulement les notes, chantait elle-même comme un oiseau. A coup sûr, tout cela, nous ne l'ignorions point, nous l'avions puisé, sans

grand effort de contrôle, dans l'*Histoire de ma vie*; et les biographes, irrésistiblement séduits par cette jolie introduction à la carrière de George Sand, en avaient fait leur pâture. Mais nous ne le savions pas à la manière dont Mme Marix-Spire nous l'enseigne ou le réapprend. Nul, avant elle, n'avait eu cure de le vérifier, de le truffer de détails denses et neufs, d'en former l'histoire cohérente d'une "famille musicienne sous l'Ancien Régime". Nul, surtout, n'en avait tiré les conséquences avec la même rigueur logique et mathématique: "Cousine des rois de France par son père, peuple par sa mère, le sentiment musical de George Sand, à l'image de ses origines raciales, est double"—savant d'un côté, spontané et populaire de l'autre, et constamment présent, sous ces deux formes entremêlées, "au plus gros de ses ennuis politiques et privés" (p. 110).

Oserai-je, après ce juste hommage, exprimer ma crainte que Mme Marix-Spire n'ait voulu trop prouver? Sa thèse d'ensemble a des vertus surabondantes, ou les défauts de ses qualités. Sans partager, nous l'avons vu, toutes les prédispositions romantiques, l'auteur se les assimile et les comprend si bien, qu'elle réussit à voir la musique par les yeux de George Sand et des contemporains de George Sand. Son zèle et sa passion, miroir fidèle, reflètent le zèle et la passion de l'époque 1830, et cette restitution suffit à garantir que l'époque 1830 n'a pas "mis la musique en disgrâce." Mais il ne suit pas de là qu'on puisse sous-estimer les raffinements ultérieurs du goût musical, et, notamment, les tentatives faites, après 1850, pour "purifier" les concepts jumeaux de musique et de poésie. Les romantiques, et jusqu'aux plus mélomanes, restent beaucoup trop enclins, selon moi, à juger la musique sur le pouvoir qu'elle a de stimuler la volupté physique, c'est-à-dire de servir d'autres dieux que les siens, et, tout particulièrement, le dieu de l'amour. Il ne m'apparaît pas non plus qu'ils se soient élevés à une doctrine claire et distincte de la correspondance des arts. Le plus grand nombre, et George Sand parmi eux, réduisent d'ordinaire cette correspondance à la solidarité pratique des artistes, contraints de se serrer les coudes dans un monde qui les tolère parce qu'ils répondent à un besoin fondamental, mais les traite en domestiques et les met au ban de la société. Que s'ils portent la discussion sur le plan esthétique, force nous est de constater que le fameux "mélange des genres" suppose rarement la fusion intime des arts. A ce propos, Lamartine professe, sur le tard, il est vrai, alors qu'elle commence à se démoder, une opinion assez répandue quelques années auparavant:

Nous comprenons très bien—écrit-il—que le musicien, le poète, le décorateur, le chanteur, le danseur, le déclamateur dramatique, le peintre et le statuaire aient la pensée de s'associer en un seul groupe d'arts confondus sur la scène, afin de produire sur la multitude un prestige souverain à l'aide de tous ces prestiges réunis. Nous n'échappons pas nous-même à la toute-puissance sensuelle de ce spectacle [...] Mais quelle que soit la force irrésistible de cette impression des arts coalisés sur notre nature, tout en la subissant, nous la jugeons, et en la jugeant du point

de vue élevé et vrai de l'art, nous ne pouvons nous empêcher de regretter pour chacun de ces arts en particulier cette coalition, ou plutôt cette promiscuité qui altère chacun dans son essence.<sup>5</sup>

Ceci nous laisse à passable distance encore, je ne dis pas de Mallarmé, trop friand de "procédés" et de "recettes" pour nous servir utilement de repoussoir, mais, tout bonnement, de Baudelaire, qui transcendera les catégories techniques, sans la moindre présomption d'hermétisme, le jour où il écrira à Wagner cette phrase célèbre: "Il me semblait que *votre* musique était *la mienne*, et je la reconnaissais, comme tout homme reconnaît les choses qu'il est destiné à aimer."

Entre M. Guichard, morose à l'excès, parce que le raidissent, à l'égard des romantiques, les "réussites" modernes de Debussy et de Ravel, et Mme Marix-Spire, que ces réussites n'intimident point, est-il, quelque part, un terrain de conciliation? Peut-être. Je n'en veux pour indice que les perspectives ouvertes, ou devrais-je dire fermées, par le chapitre de M. Guichard sur Gérard de Nerval. Ce chapitre me déçoit un peu, je l'avoue, et présente l'auteur des *Chimères* sous son aspect le plus conventionnel: il a aimé les chansons populaires, il les a "citées et comprises en poète et en musicien". Mais n'a-t-il pas aimé autre chose? N'a-t-il pas, mieux que personne à son époque, prêté l'oreille à la musique des sphères? Et n'a-t-il point traduit dans son style, avec une légèreté arachnéenne, des harmonies qui, pour être secrètes, n'en sont pas moins des harmonies? D'un mot, je ne crois pas qu'on puisse apprécier le contenu musical de la littérature romantique sur la seule base de ses témoignages explicites et de l'intérêt en quelque sorte palpable dont tel ou tel écrivain a fait preuve envers les œuvres et les compositeurs. A ce titre, Dumas père vaudrait presque son ami Nerval; Lamartine, qui fuyait, paraît-il, quand la maîtresse de maison s'asseyait à son piano, aurait dépensé en pure perte les torrents de mélodie qui coulent de sa plume; Chateaubriand, que M. Guichard et Mme Marix-Spire renvoient avec une égale désinvolture, le céderait à Mme de Staël, assez fortunée pour avoir disserté sur la musique, mais dont je ne sache pas qu'elle ait jamais été dénommée "l'Enchanteresse". Certes, Mme Marix-Spire a raison, cent fois raison, de se fier, en dernière analyse, à l'*instinct musical* de George Sand et d'en chercher la trace dans les qualités orchestrales de son œuvre. Mais ni elle, ni M. Guichard n'ont appliqué ce même principe à d'autres auteurs: d'où vient que la distribution de palmes effectuée par Mme Marix-Spire risque de n'être pas entièrement équitable, et que l'abandon relatif où M. Guichard finit par laisser le romantisme pourra sembler prématuré.

*Columbia University*

JEAN-ALBERT BÉDÉ

5. *Cours familier de littérature*, 30<sup>e</sup> entretien, ch. XX; cité par Raymond Leslie Evans, *Les Romantiques français et la musique*, p. 142.

## REVIEWS IN BRIEF

*Adrian und Epictitus, nebst verwandten Texten (Joca Monachorum).* Ed. Walther Suchier. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1956. Pp. v + 144. This book is the author's latest contribution to what may be called the *Enfant sage* literature. He is concerned with the ramifications in Latin and in the vernaculars of the common medieval type of riddle where a person of outstanding wisdom answers a series of questions on biblical or secular subjects. The "wise child" refers to a person sent to the army in the eastern Roman Empire who answers questions put to him by soldiers with such ability that he attracts the attention of the Emperor Hadrian, whose questions he in turn answers with remarkable skill. The riddles which he answers and which form the main part of all the versions are of the most various sorts. Many depend on the Bible and the Apocrypha while others are little more than plays upon words and offer no concrete information, e.g. "Qui dedit quod non accepit? Eva lactae." Such plays upon words were obviously popular and were regarded as having value in themselves; perhaps literary historians should pay more attention to the facet of medieval literature which they illustrate.

Suchier points out that the very numerous vernacular versions of these and similar questions go back to the first of the dialogues which are published here, namely the *Adrian et Epictitus*. He lists seven Latin MSS of this work, ranging in date from the tenth to the fifteenth century, as well as French, Provençal, and Welsh versions. On the basis of these MSS and using the oldest where possible as his basic text, Professor Suchier constructs two Latin versions and adds those in the vernaculars. The Latin versions are the result of careful collation and the relations between them are set out with great clarity in comparative tables. The collated texts and the detailed apparatus make it clear that the editor is right in asserting that we have here the result of accretion and compilation rather than carefully constructed dialogues and that the various versions, have in their different stages of development, been influenced by other compilations of a similar nature, in particular the *Alteratio Hadriani et Epictiti*. More dubious is the statement that the oldest version is "ein rein der Unterhaltung dienendes Büchlein—ein für jede Zeit wohl ziemlich einzigartiges Unternehmen." Although some of the answers to the questions seem flippant, there is no reason to suppose that they were not, like other writings of the time, intended for the edification of the reader.

The *Joca Monachorum*, here printed in various versions, are in many ways similar to the questions and answers of the *Adrian et Epictitus* but show a more religious trend. The editor has treated the variants with the same care and skill as he displayed in the earlier dialogues. It is only natural that Professor Suchier's main interest should lie in the constitution of critical texts and in the relationships between the various versions. The non-specialist, however, must ask what place these texts have in the history of medieval literature and what help they can offer in its study. In this regard Professor Suchier is less informative. His notes do indeed give much valuable information about parallel passages and some help in the understanding of the numerous obscure references. But even with this help, most readers, including this reviewer, would probably welcome a more thorough explanation and in particular a longer introduction, in which the editor might compare these dialogues, e.g. with the numerous variants of the *Salman* and *Marolf* series. How often

are the same questions asked in both types? What difference of purpose is apparent? How far are the answers characteristic of general medieval opinion? It is the answers to such questions as this which would be of most value to the student of medieval literature. It is to be hoped that Professor Suchier will one day give us the benefit of his unique knowledge of the topic in a work which answers these questions. Meanwhile it may be said that all medievalists should take advantage of the excellent texts here provided to acquaint themselves with some information which, however fragmentary, reflects material available to medieval authors and which can be of considerable assistance in elucidating obscurities in works more widely known and read. (W. T. H. JACKSON, *Columbia University*)

Angelo Poliziano, *Stanze cominciate per la giostra di Giuliano de' Medici*. Edizione critica a cura di Vincenzo Pernicone. Torino: Loescher-Chiantore, 1954. Pp. lxxxv + 89. Seven MSS of Poliziano's *Stanze* are extant, none of them autographic. From the *editio princeps* of 1494 (Bologna) to the one by Giosue Carducci (1863) we have a large number of constantly deteriorating editions (as shown by Carducci's own accurate analysis), none of them drawing upon the MS tradition. Carducci based his excellent work of textual restoration on the *princeps* and on Riccardian 2723 and 1576, and his text had until now remained almost unaltered, most scholars believing that a substantial improvement was beyond reasonable hope. Nonetheless, Professor Pernicone's hopefulness must be considered far from unreasonable, since it has apparently borne excellent fruit. In fact, despite the availability of fairly good manuscripts and early printed editions as well, for four and a half centuries a unique gem of Renaissance lyricism was offered to the public only in second class versions, as even Carducci's masterful text appears, after careful philological examination, to be deficient.

We owe to Vincenzo Pernicone a scientific classification of the sources: he eliminates M<sup>2</sup> and O (Magliabechiano Cl. VII, 947 and Oliveriano 51) since they derive from the printed tradition, establishes that R<sup>2</sup>, C and P (Riccardiano 2723, Add. 16439 già Chigiano 2333 of the British Museum, Ms. It. 1543 of the Bibl. Nat. of Paris) have a common origin and are the most authoritative group, and finally contends that R<sup>1</sup> and M<sup>1</sup> (Riccardiano 1576 and Magliabechiano II, X, 54) are subordinated to R<sup>2</sup>CP. As for the printed tradition, the *princeps* (B) is immune from the small gaps which mar R<sup>2</sup>CP; it must therefore derive from a different archetype. Confronted with B, M<sup>1</sup> reveals a common origin with B itself for Book I, with R<sup>2</sup>CP for Book II. If these conclusions are correct, Professor Pernicone is then justified in excluding the B readings not confirmed by M<sup>1</sup> for Book I, whereas for Book II B and R<sup>2</sup>CPM<sup>1</sup> are of equal importance. We then have three basic traditions: R<sup>2</sup>CP, R<sup>1</sup>, B. The fundamental one is the first (traced back to an archetype of the first decade after the composition of the *Stanze*), to be constantly checked against the other two.

Morphologically, I find the Pernicone edition impeccable in the general criterion applied (in the specific case of the *Stanze*) to the readings of oscillating grammatical forms, such as articles, possessives, desinences, and spellings literary at times, dialectal at others.<sup>1</sup> The general spelling is based on the MSS, with justified sacrifice of uniformity and modernity.

1. For the most authoritative treatment of these and all basic linguistic aspects of fifteenth-century Italian see B. Migliorini, "Panorama dell'italiano quattrocentesco," *La Rassegna Italiana*, LIX (1955), 1-39.

After the all-philological Introduction, where Professor Pernicone's clarity of analysis has the rare virtue of making complex problems appear simple, the text is neatly and elegantly presented, with abundant notes whose character matches that of the Introduction; they contain the variant readings and discussions of all cases of departure from Carducci's text. We must congratulate the editor for this major achievement in the field of textual criticism and the publisher Chiantore as well for this excellent start in its new "Biblioteca del Giornale Storico."

As far as I have seen, reviewers have been most favorably impressed by the accuracy of this edition. I will however refer the specialist to A. Mauro's few reasonable objections, like the criticism concerning the duplication of consonant in *ammanto*, *cammino*, *mattutina*, *femminea*, *cozzar*, *dolcezza*.<sup>2</sup> N. Vianello has recently discussed the nature and value of the controversial Tizzone edition of 1526 (Venice), three copies of which he has just found, whereas Pernicone had not been able to find any; but the latter has promptly replied to Vianello's criticism by refuting his reevaluation.<sup>3</sup>

Professor Pernicone has been working for several years on the complete edition of Poliziano's vernacular works, and the present volume was separately put forth on the occasion of the fifth centenary of the poet's birth. (ALDO SCAGLIONE, University of California, Berkeley)

*Studies in Renaissance Thought and Letters.* By Paul Oskar Kristeller. Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1956. Pp. 583. This work brings together in a single volume most of Professor Kristeller's shorter studies on the thought and culture of the Italian Renaissance, the great majority previously published in journals here and abroad between 1936 and 1950. Thus we now have "legato con amore in un volume" valuable materials which have been so widely dispersed that only a distinctly superior library would have them all, and we have them in a much more convenient form.

To review such a work is difficult and, in this case, almost superfluous. The studies collected in this book are part of the standard literature on the Italian Renaissance and will be familiar to scholars working in the field. Their collection and republication will serve to give them the wider audience they deserve. From another standpoint, perhaps the best review of this book already exists in the author's small volume of Martin Classical Lectures (Vol. XV), *The Classics and Renaissance Thought* (Cambridge, Mass., 1955). The luminous generalizations and fresh perspectives of that work are the fruit of the years of meticulous research and careful reflection of which *Studies in Renaissance Thought and Letters* is a substantial, although partial, record.

It is more than erudition, great as that is, that establishes Professor Kristeller's eminence among the students of the Italian Renaissance. It is also the kind and breadth of his learning, for he has worked with materials previously ignored—unpublished MSS, the records of academies, libraries and educational institutions—and he has brought to his field of specialization a thorough knowledge of ancient, medieval and post-renaissance thought. The main direction of his work is given by the conviction that we must find, edit and interpret the sources before we can make real progress in our understanding of the Italian Renaissance, and that the

2. Cf. *Giornale Italiano di Filologia*, VIII (1955), 184-87.

3. Cf. N. Vianello, "Per il testo delle *Stanze del P.*," *Lettore Italiane*, VII (1955), 330-41; Pernicone, "L'Edizione tizzoniana delle *Stanze del P.*," *GSLI*, CXXXIII (1956), 226-36.

life of institutions is as important as the productions of "master spirits" if we are to move on to valid generalization. The quality of his results derives at least in part from the ability to distinguish truly what is new in the Renaissance from what is old, what has lived on as a permanent conquest of thought from what has died. If the best modern scholarship on the Italian Renaissance spares us the stale clichés of glorification and resists the impulse to reduce the period entirely to its medieval antecedents, we owe it largely to Professor Kristeller's research and influence.

Perhaps the most serviceable thing this reviewer can do is to describe the contents of this book and remind the reader of what is available here. The author has arranged his studies in four groups according to subject matter. The first is composed of three introductory essays, one of which, "Philosophical Movements of the Renaissance," has not been previously published in English. The second and longest group is on Marsilio Ficino and his circle. These studies the author describes as "by-products or afterthoughts of my work on Marsilio Ficino" and they include such important past contributions as "The Scholastic Background of Marsilio Ficino" and "Marsilio Ficino e Lodovico Lazzarelli: Contributo alla diffusione delle idee ermetiche nel Rinascimento," as well as some previously unpublished material. Among the latter is a new essay on "Lay Religious Traditions and Florentine Platonism." This suggestive study, another of Professor Kristeller's correctives for the still current notion of a "pagan" Renaissance, explores the influence of lay religious associations and their ideals and teachings on the origin and growth of Ficino's thought and of his Academy. Two unpublished letters of Ficino, six poems concerning him, and some notes on Ficino codices, editions and documents, complete the new material in this section.

The last two sections, "Problems and Aspects of the Renaissance" and "From the Middle Ages to the Renaissance" grow out of the author's "more recent interest in the university learning of the Renaissance, and in the medieval origins of Renaissance humanism." There is one new essay in these two groups, "Francesco Bandini and his Consolatory Dialogue upon the Death of Simone Gondi," an interesting study of a specimen of the ancient genre of the Consolation of Death revived by the fifteenth-century humanists. Reprinted here are such stimulating and important essays as "The Philosophy of Man in the Italian Renaissance," "Nuove fonti per la storia dell'umanesimo italiano," "Music and Learning in the Early Italian Renaissance" and "The Origin and Development of the Language of Italian Prose," among several others. The general utility of this book is considerably extended by the inclusion of a splendid bibliography, an index of manuscripts and incunabula, a list of *initia* and an index of names.

Although Professor Kristeller claims only an implicit unity for his book, a kind in his own words "stemming from my own interests and point of view, and from the general subject of which I have tried to grasp certain facts and episodes," a true unity does emerge from this collection. In spite of their diversity, all the articles contribute to elucidating the complex and organic interrelations of the various aspects of Renaissance culture, the links between individuals and institutions, music and learning, politics and humanism, religion and philosophy, medicine and scholarship. These essays together afford us a richer and more complex awareness of the period, one deriving from the cumulative impact of the studies in their very variety, which they could not have had individually.

In rereading these essays this reviewer was again impressed by the wealth of

facts and judicious interpretations and the many hints and suggestions, implicit and explicit, for further research. There is a great deal in this volume which still remains to be absorbed, and in this new form Professor Kristeller's studies should continue to stimulate further inquiry and reflections. (JOSEPH A. MAZZEO, Cornell University)

*Malherbe et son temps: IV<sup>e</sup> Centenaire de naissance (1555-1955). Etudes.* In: *XVII<sup>e</sup> Siècle. Bulletin de la "Société d'Etude du XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle,"* No. 31 (Avril 1956), pp. 169-375. In contrast to 1928's half-hearted commemoration of Malherbe's death, 1955 has brought forth in Paris, Aix and Caen a number of observances celebrating the fourth centenary of the poet's birth. M. Raymond Lebègue, the well-known Malherbe scholar, has written a warmly sympathetic introduction to the series of lectures delivered at the Sorbonne on Malherbe and his time.

The first lecture "Malherbe à la Cour et à la Ville" by M. Georges Mongrédiens, president of the *Société d'Etude du XVII<sup>e</sup> Siècle*, undertakes the delicate task of evoking and interpreting Malherbe in his private life and social relations and succeeds in softening the outlines of the fierce old grammarian's portrait.

M. V. L. Saulnier, in his essay on "Malherbe et le XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle" reminds us that Malherbe belongs in large measure, both chronologically and esthetically, to the Renaissance. Seen in this perspective, Malherbe's contribution to French poetry is three-fold; first, he proclaimed the necessity of a fixed and regular system of poetics; secondly, he awakened fellow-poets from the lethargy of unimaginative routine, and, finally, he gained the glory of the theoretician who preaches a doctrine of methodical effort. However, M. Saulnier's contention that Malherbe sacrificed some measure of fame as a poet in devotion to his arduous labors as a reformer seems more generous than accurate.

Redressing the balance against the weight of severe criticism of Malherbe's commentary on Desportes—typified by Brunot's assertion that Malherbe had diverted the current of French poetry from its true course—M. Lebègue, in his lecture on "Malherbe Quintilius," has re-emphasized the importance of Malherbe's vigorous struggle against the slovenly verbiage all too prevalent in the works of his contemporaries.

Of all these essays, that of M. René Fromilhague, writer of the authoritative thesis *Malherbe, technique et création poétique*, is broadest in philosophic scope. M. Fromilhague emphasizes the complete shift in philosophic values from the expansive naturalism of the Renaissance to the Christian stoicism prevalent in the time of Malherbe and Montaigne. The importance of Malherbe stems not from the fact that he codified the laws and summed up the inevitable tendencies of his time but from the fact that he imposed upon it a radically new concept of poetic creation. Making the best of both the positive qualities and the failings of his crabbed character, Malherbe not only made certain poetic precepts into absolute imperatives but—more important—attributed to the rules a value in themselves as obstacles stimulating the poet's creative ingenuity. To this dour grammarian and unprolific poet must be granted the glory of founding French classicism, taking the word not in its limited historical sense but in its largest esthetic meaning.

In a completely different vein, M. R.-L. Wagner has studied some features of Malherbe's poetic language, or more exactly, Malherbe's poetic vocabulary. The author points out the dichotomy between the poet's doctrine and his work and a

further discrepancy between his taste for the simple and concrete in poetry and his predilection for images shocking taste as well as reason. His study is provocative, giving us brief insights into Malherbe's poetic sensitivity, a sensitivity which, though limited in range, is more subtle and complex than is commonly believed.

Mme L. Maurice-Amour takes issue with the legend originated by Racan that Malherbe was totally lacking in musical discrimination. Her lecture entitled "Les Poésies de Malherbe et les musiciens de son temps" points out that over a fourth of Malherbe's poetic production is intended to be accompanied by music. Although it is impossible to define the limits of Malherbe's musical sensitivity or to describe the poet's relations with the musicians, Mme Maurice-Amour's study makes it plain that it was the poet who imposed his rhythms on the musician in the majority of cases.

The first lecture of this series, presented in seventh place in the order of the printed text under the title "Un Ami de Malherbe: Le Poète Jean de la Ceppède" is a skilfully written discussion by M. Pierre Clarac of the *Théorèmes* of this Provençal poet, one of the few to whom Malherbe granted a measure of esteem. The sonnet-sequence *Les Théorèmes* of La Ceppède forms an organic whole full of fervent piety expressed in strikingly direct and homely terms. M. Clarac demonstrates the metrical resources and breadth of register of this Provençal Rubens. His suggestion that a complete re-edition of the *Théorèmes* is in order seems highly commendable.

M. Jean Rousset's thought-provoking essay on "La Poésie baroque au temps de Malherbe: La Métaphore" focuses attention on this stylistic feature as a touchstone in the esthetic crisis of the early seventeenth century. For Malherbe, and others of a rationalistic cast of mind, the metaphor must be a subordinate element, translating common reality; for Mlle de Gournay, the metaphor represents the "principale richesse [...] d'un poème" and connotes the world of analogy and poetic correspondences then threatened by the new science.

These lectures, grouped under the heading *Malherbe et son temps* heighten our appreciation of the vital and many-faceted period in which Malherbe played a major role. Several of them indirectly emphasize the importance of M. Fromilhague's recently published theses on Malherbe. By both their range of interest and their depth, they are well suited to interest and instruct a wide audience, without descending to vulgarization. (ARTHUR L. KURTH, *University of Florida*)

*Pascal et la souffrance*. Par Lucien Jerphagnon. Paris: Les Editions Ouvrières, 1956. Pp. xvi + 188. L'auteur analyse la question du mal et de la souffrance à la lumière de la vie et de l'œuvre de Pascal. Celui qui, de son propre aveu, "depuis l'âge de dix-huit ans, n'avait pas passé un jour sans douleur" offrait, à cet égard, un remarquable champ d'étude.

Dans la première partie, l'expérience personnelle que Pascal avait de la souffrance est exposée. Se référant au diagnostic du Dr. Nautiacq et à celui plus récent du Dr. Torlais, l'auteur suppose que Pascal souffrait d'un ulcéro-cancer de l'estomac dont la forme terminale aurait été celle d'une méningite carcinomateuse. Toutefois, M. Jerphagnon ne s'attarde pas à l'in vérifiable; alliant la solidité du raisonnement à la précision de l'observation, il définit la physionomie morale de celui qu'il nomme un "passionné de race pure." Et vraiment, cette étude du caractère de Pascal est excellente. Sa simplicité sonne vrai. Nous n'en connaissons pas de meilleure.

L'auteur applique à la personnalité de Pascal les critères psychologiques conçus par l'Ecole caractérielle de Groningue et par Le Senne. Les avantages que présente la méthode de cette école étant de ne pas isoler les données psychiques ou physiologiques et de sauvegarder l'unité de la conscience en replaçant chaque fait dans l'ensemble auquel il appartient.

Le schéma caractériel, donc, range l'apologiste dans la catégorie des E A S: Emotifs Actifs à Retentissement secondaire. Nous voilà bien avancés, dirons-nous? Sans doute, l'énoncé rebute; ce jargon aurait fait grimacer Pascal. Eh bien, la réussite de M. Jerphagnon est de nous rendre ces termes clairs, utiles, convaincants. Il introduit le lecteur plus avant dans la connaissance de Pascal en reliant les traits qui lui sont propres à une classe entière d'hommes. Tout en restant lui-même, Pascal devient typique—c'est dire que son humanité exceptionnelle est mise en relief.

M. Jerphagnon insiste sur trois composantes de cette personnalité: émotivité, avidité, curiosité. Les rapports entre ce caractère passionné et son besoin d'action efficace, sa recherche constante des fins dernières, sont expliqués avec naturel et conviction. L'auteur conclut que "la vie de Pascal fut profondément équilibrée (p. 106).

On reprochera à M. Jerphagnon de ne pas insister assez sur Pascal honnête homme, de trop considérer l'homme en fonction des trois ou quatre dernières années de sa vie. Il a raison de souligner les signes d'émotivité aiguë manifestés au moment de la controverse avec le P. Noël (p. 54), mais il semble oublier que Pascal n'avait pas "commencé." Et M. Jerphagnon n'exagère-t-il pas la frustration affective que Pascal aurait ressentie au contact de son père (pp. 102-03)? Etienne Pascal était-il vraiment si peu amusant, si peu commode à vivre? Voilà qui paraît s'opposer à ce que nous savons de l'éducation originale qu'il avait eu la patience, lui-même, de donner à son fils.

La deuxième partie du livre de M. Jerphagnon traite de l'œuvre, de la vision pascalienne du mal et de la souffrance. On l'apprécie moins, car elle est surtout consacrée à un résumé exhaustif de la pensée de Pascal. Ce compte-rendu n'était peut-être pas aussi nécessaire que l'auteur l'estime.

Dans les dernières pages, on retiendra cette image d'un Pascal se refusant à réduire la souffrance à des formules intelligibles. Pour lui, le mal n'était pas une abstraction, c'était un élément concret qu'il fallait intégrer à l'économie du salut. M. Jerphagnon exprime bien la chose: "Devant le dogme du péché originel, les apologistes s'écrient: voici l'explication! Pascal dit: voici l'homme." C'est précisément l'homme Pascal que M. Jerphagnon a saisi avec une clarté, une mesure, une noble perspicacité qui méritent l'attention et le respect. (J.-J. DEMOREST, Cornell University)

*New Light on Molière. Tartuffe; Elmire hypocondre.* By John Cairncross. Genève: Droz, 1956. Pp. xi + 78. The main part of Mr. Cairncross's book is a fifty-page study of "The Riddle of the First *Tartuffe*, or the three-act *Urtartuffe*, as he pleasantly calls it, of May 12, 1664. As no texts persist, he has in hand only our standard *Tartuffe* of 1669, a full description (in *La Lettre sur l'Imposteur*) of the second version, *Panulphe ou l'Imposteur*, of 1667, and the speculations of various scholars, especially Morf, Lancaster, Charlier, and Michaut.

Arraying all his evidence, and acutely analyzing the standard *Tartuffe*, Mr. Cairncross propounds the thesis that the *Urtartuffe* was complete in three acts,

corresponding roughly to Acts I, III, and IV of our *Tartuffe*. It would be unfair to summarize in a few words his orderly, compact reasoning. Let it suffice that he examines critically all the evidence (including the probative value of La Grange's *Registre*), and that he attempts to distinguish the "various layers of composition" in our text. In the opinion of this reviewer, he makes his case. He establishes a probability which should stand until someone can argue a better probability, or until a document turns up to make all probabilities nugatory.

Mr. Cairncross's booklet concludes with two notes on *Elomire hypocondre*, well enough, but much less decisive than his work on *Tartuffe*.

Have I space to draw a little moral? All the possibilities for scholarship in the resolution of important historico-literary problems are not exhausted. Mr. Cairncross has demonstrated that with knowledge and common sense one may still resolve old problems anew, and find new answers, new meanings, for literary historians and for common readers. (MORRIS BISHOP, Cornell University)

*Racine and English Classicism*. By Katherine E. Wheatley. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1956. Pp. 337. The first half of this book deals with English attempts in the neo-classical period to adapt several of Racine's tragedies to English audiences. Professor Wheatley discusses in detail *Andromaque*, *Bérénice*, *Bajazet*, *Iphigénie*, *Phèdre*, *La Thébaïde* and *Britannicus* as these plays were done into English by such well-known playwrights as Otway and Congreve and by such very minor figures as Crowne, Boyer, Edmund Smith, Charles Johnson, Ambrose Philips, Sir Brooke Boothby and a Mrs. J. Robe. In every case, the author is severe in her judgment of the English effort to acclimatize Racine on the hither side of the Channel. Her opinion of Ambrose Philips' version of *Andromaque*—*The Distrest Mother*—is typical of the conclusions to which her research has led her: "All things considered, the great success of *The Distrest Mother* both with the critics and with the public does not indicate that the English understood or appreciated Racine during the 18th century." Lytton Strachey was to find the same truth still valid in the 1920's and, so far as I know, Racine has not yet been adequately translated into English and perhaps never will be.

The second half of the book treats both English neo-classical dramatic theory and its application to Racine from 1674 to 1721. The author finds that English criticism from Rymer on simplified the French notion of tragedy and she is as severe with the critics as she has been with the playwrights. She rightly criticizes Rymer's parochialism and bestows praise chiefly on the minor writer Charles Gildon although "Gildon's protest came too late. The vogue of translation and adaptation of Racine was over."

This is a book for which one might think that there was neither need nor excuse. The English of the Restoration were evidently not prepared to "understand" Racine any more than they were prepared to revive the religious quarrels of the 1640's. And since English-speaking audiences do not yet seem ready for Racine, the cause of their unreadiness must be assumed to lie deeper than any matter of translation. Professor Wheatley proves in a lavish way what anyone might have suspected—that Racine was not faithfully done into English. But of course not. Imagine trying to turn into English the line in which Hermione complains to an indifferent Pyrrhus: "Je t'amais inconstant, qu'aurais-je fait fidèle?" As Henry Adams said of teaching at Harvard, "It cannot be done."

Professor Wheatley calls herself a "Racinophile" but insists that she is concerned

neither with Racine's plays nor with those of his English adapters as "works of art," although clearly it is their status as works of art which alone justifies discussing them at all. She says, instead, that she intends to demonstrate "by copious citations" (the book jacket makes the same quantitative boast) that Racine was misunderstood and mistranslated by the English neo-classicists. But to whom, then, are her remarks addressed? If specialists in the field do not already know what this work has so fully demonstrated, one is entitled to wonder what they do know.

But what about more important questions? Otway and the others with whom this book deals chose to present Racine, however they understood or failed to understand him, to English audiences. They succeeded in doing so. They did not present the Racine whom we read in French or see at the Salle Richelieu. But in complaining of this fact, Professor Wheatley is objecting to history and to inevitable differences in language and national character. T. S. Eliot once condemned Milton as the author of that split in sensibility which made post-Miltonic poetry mere fancy decorating "thought." Later Eliot decided that Milton was not as responsible as the whole course of European history for the "dissociated sensibility" which he lamented. Professor Wheatley might have followed Eliot's example and looked for the larger and deeper reasons which account for the English failure to grasp Racine (or, on occasion during the period with which this book deals, to grasp Shakespeare). (DONALD MAHER, *Columbia University*)

*Charles Duclos (1704-1772).* Par Paul Meister. Genève: Droz, 1956. Pp. 273. This book is a model of the painstaking, meticulous, exhaustively documented work which in general does not pretend to enter the realm of purely literary criticism. M. Meister has consulted every scrap of available printed and manuscript material concerning his subject and the result will obviously remain, perhaps for all time, the standard reference book on Duclos. The study is divided into three parts, first a biographical treatment, then a thorough exploration of possible literary influences by and upon Duclos and finally an attempt to situate his work in the intellectual and social framework of his age.

Duclos emerges from under the microscope of M. Meister as a rather likeable type who wielded far more influence as man of action than as man of letters. Using the Mornet system of assessing Duclos' reading public during his lifetime, M. Meister finds that *Mme de Luz*, for example, was exceptionally popular and that *Les Confessions du Comte de \*\*\** was, after the best-selling *Lettres d'une Péruvienne*, the most widely-read French novel which appeared between 1740 and 1760. Yet the literary influence of Duclos upon major authors of his time was negligible. His personal influence, however, was another matter. As M. Meister writes: "Au terme de cet examen détaillé des rapports entre les deux auteurs, nous croyons pouvoir affirmer que parmi les gens de lettres, Duclos fut de loin celui qui joua le plus grand rôle dans la vie de Rousseau, et l'amitié qui les unit est d'autant plus surprenante que tout semblait devoir les séparer" (p. 45). And there were others besides Rousseau: Montesquieu, Helvétius, D'Alembert, Marmontel, Marivaux. Although Duclos is listed as one of the collaborators in the *Encyclopédie*, it was inevitable that his relations with this group should be severely affected by his friendship for Rousseau and by the rupture in 1757 between the latter and his former friends. Taking full advantage of the new edition of the so-called *Mémoires* of Mme d'Epinal by M. Georges Roth (*Histoire de Mme de Montbrillant* [Paris: Gallimard, 1951]), M. Meister shows how subsequent critics (notably Sainte-Beuve) have misjudged

the character of Duclos because of the presentation of Mme d'Epinay and her collaborators.

Perhaps the most significant segment of the book is that devoted to Duclos' association with the Académie Française. He was elected to that body, albeit with rather slight literary baggage of his own, on September 22, 1746 and nine years later became its "perpetual" secretary. As M. Meister states and proves, "[...] il marqua l'Académie de son empreinte" (p. 107). He exerted great influence in the election of new members (e.g., Buffon and D'Alembert) and firmly resisted intervention into the affairs of the Academy by the ministers, being convinced that the Academy was under the immediate protection of the king. His relations with the latter were not solely limited to his capacity in the Academy, as he was also named Royal Historiographer in 1755 and the following year was given for life an apartment in the Luxembourg palace.

M. Meister has patiently and thoroughly sifted all extant documents in the course of his study (his notes, reproduction of *inédits*, iconography and bibliography are exemplary), yet he never indulges in exaggeration or in false claims for his man. For example, in writing of the striking affinity between Duclos and Stendhal, he makes a statement which also characterizes his own work: "Bien qu'il ait fait grand cas de Duclos [...] il ne l'a jamais surestimé et n'a jamais vu en lui qu'un des meilleurs auteurs de second ordre" (p. 151). (JOSEPH R. SMILEY, *University of Illinois*)

*Gérard de Nerval et le mythe*. Par Marie-Jeanne Durry. Paris: Flammarion, 1956. Pp. 185. Rousseau, Chateaubriand, Proust, among others, tried to recall the past as a solace for present woes. Gérard de Nerval differed from them in that he tried to attach his past and present to a kind of pre-sentient experience which would identify him with the permanent myths of humanity. By so doing he not only nearly solved the riddle of his own existence but also escaped savoring again the bitter reality of his actual memories. At the same time, he succeeded in getting himself said without seeming to confess. Gérard, who objected to "le goût des autobiographies, des mémoires, et des confessions ou confidences," used the mythic heroes of us all as the universal cloak for striking *sua culpa*.

For Nerval, no legend, myth or history existed for itself alone. Each was a high-road of personal evocation inviting him to undertake a voyage of self-discovery. Instinctively, in everything he heard, saw or read, Gérard saw himself: in the world drama he saw his own drama which became again the world's drama. All the heroes of mythology, all the figures of history, and even the *dramatis personae* of imaginative literature were or might have been himself. Moreover, Gérard firmly believed that everything written or said was possible in this or other worlds, as he put it.

Equipped with these notions, Nerval sought out a mythical Orient which it was given to him to find because he had already seen it in his daydreams. The hero of pagan mythology now saw himself as the god of various Near Eastern sects, and incidentally, became one of the first authentic students of comparative religion. In examining these faiths, Gérard was drawn close to Christianity, which he was then able to see in its proper focus. Thus in the *Voyage en Orient* the first person singular pronoun takes care of exterior events; the important inner revelations come from the mouths of gods of Persian, Egyptian and quasi-Christian faiths.

Passing these ideas through the crucibles of Leibnitz, Herder and Goethe (*Faust*,

Part II), Gérard set out on his quest of the eternal beloved. Sophie Dawes, Jenny Colon, Marie Pleyel only served to call up memories of ideal loves he had known in another existence. For many years Gérard floundered about in an attempt to find the connecting thread. The clue seems to have been offered him while reading Nodier's short story *Francesco Columna*. Nodier's favorite theme of eternal union in love beyond the grave, given its best expression in this delightful *conte*, his conception of Francesco as a strange alliance of Christian belief and pagan estheticism, struck Nerval. Sophie, Jenny, Marie stood revealed as the present counterparts of Helen of Troy, the Queen of Sheba and the Fair Mélusine. As he slipped across the margin of sanity in the gathering darkness of his last years, each encounter with these women in his dreams produced a further transformation, more illuminating and more meaningful to Gérard. However, as the veils fell one by one from the figures of Isis, the Virgin Mary, his mother, as the clarity of his vision sharpened, the vigor of his creative genius waned. Was it despair in the face of this dilemma, the promise of standing face to face with the goddess and thus finally understanding once and for all the meaning of his existence, or was it to hasten the sweet union, envisioned, but hourly slipping from his grasp that led Gérard to take his own life?

Out of this material Mme Durry has composed a medley of happy intuitions and intelligent *aperçus*. The reader can have nothing but admiration for her sound scholarship and probing method, but there is something too pat, too short-breathed in her approach to this study. The reader senses in it all the confining qualities of the lecture room, where the jotted-down notes lead the speaker deftly from point to point. Here the miscellaneous thinking that results from hastily assembling ideas previously confided to fugitive reminders or *fiches* is permanently congealed in the deep-freeze of print. There are other indications of haste: we are told in a footnote, p. 8, that the asterisks "renvoient à quelques notes placées à la fin du volume." On p. 152 and again on p. 164, there are asterisks, yet there are no corresponding notes in the appendix. (A. RICHARD OLIVER, *Washington and Jefferson College*)

*Balzac et Rabelais*. Par Maurice Lecuyer. (*Etudes Françaises*, no. 47). Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1956. Pp. 222. The spiritual kinship of Balzac with Rabelais, already noted by the former's contemporaries, was first studied seriously by Pietro Toldo in 1905. Since then much has been said about the titanic novelist's debt to his renaissance predecessor, and Maurice Lecuyer has neglected none of these many contributions in assembling the rich data which he presents in a systematic, thorough, and readable manner.

M. Lecuyer's account of editions of Rabelais from 1789 to 1850 is derived largely from Jacques Boulenger's *Pléiade* edition. He has verified all the entries, correcting slight errors in dates and formats, and has pointed up the concentration of important editions between 1820 and 1830, a period which marked both the height of Rabelaisian fervor in France and the period of Balzac's literary apprenticeship. Balzac knew the best editions of Rabelais; he owned Desoer's 1820 text and read Niceron's biography, the most reliable of the time. M. Lecuyer argues convincingly against Boulenger's claim that Balzac was not fully aware of maître François' biography. The documentation is convincing and well presented.

M. Lecuyer leans heavily on the works of Sainéan and Boulenger to emphasize the frenzy of the Romantic period for Rabelais. There is a brief list of the literary greats and what they thought of Rabelais. In the eighteenth century, he was con-

sidered "peu raffiné, en tout cas juste bon à distraire sans plus" (p. 69). This is not entirely true, as Fontenelle was now drawn, now repelled, by the humorist (see H. Potez, "Rabelais et Fontenelle," RER, VI [1908], 362-67) and Diderot took Rabelais' satire very seriously in *La Promenade du sceptique* (*Oeuvres complètes*, I, 195). But it was after the revolution that Rabelais became the popular figure to whom all the romantics, except Lamartine, were attracted.

M. Lecuyer seriously believes that the comic gift of Balzac and Rabelais has its origin in the environmental soil around Tours. Another reason for affinities: according to Balzac's sister, their father was a man after Montaigne, Rabelais and Uncle Toby and his Rabelaisian constitution was inherited by Honoré. An education along eighteenth-century rational and optimistic lines reinforced the strain of naturalism in Balzac's makeup.

Part III, "Le Grand Chinonais dans l'œuvre du Tourangeau" (pp. 101-204), contains M. Lecuyer's substantial original contribution. Balzac consistently appreciated Rabelais "le satirique [...] celui qui dit à la société ses dures vérités" (p. 107). The basis of the literary relationship is that "lorsqu'il s'agit de juger maître Rabelais, Honoré ne peut s'empêcher d'admirer cet homme avec lequel il se sent lié par une grande communauté de caractère et de tempérament" (p. 109).

While stressing Rabelaisian epicurianism in the *Contes drolatiques*, Lecuyer does not neglect the novelist's acknowledged debts to Boccaccio, Marguerite de Navarre, Béroalde de Verville, and others. Balzac pays homage to Rabelais in many works, but nowhere so exorbitantly as in *Le Cousin Pons* where he is proclaimed "le plus grand esprit de l'humanité moderne." Chapter II of this section is the wealthiest in new "rapprochements." Rabelais' stylistic devices are found in many of Balzac's works. Some unexpected passages of the *Comédie humaine* prove that the "cure dé Meudon a dû être un stimulant, un modèle, sinon un exemple pour sa Comédie humaine" (p. 137). When fictional personalities and incidents are examined, it appears that Balzac uses Panurge and his adventures most frequently. Panurge is the prototype of all the happy-go-lucky Bixiou and Bianchon in the *Comédie humaine*. When ideas are compared, Lecuyer posits a debatable point: "La croyance au triomphe de la santé sur la maladie, de la vie sur la mort, est très intime chez eux" (p. 162). Anti-feminism in both writers is noted and Lecuyer finds the *Contes drolatiques* superior to the *Comédie humaine* because it was closer to Balzac's heart.

The danger of studies in influence or parallelism lies in an exclusive quest for similarities that often tend to distort and blur vital differences. Although he is conscious of this pitfall, M. Lecuyer's conclusions still leave much to be desired. Many coincidences are gratuitous and insignificant. This one, for example: the death of Rabelais twenty-one years after *Pantagruel* and the death of the novelist twenty-one years after *La Physiologie du mariage* (p. 209). Rabelais' naturalism and Balzac's realism are reduced to the exploitation of the details of life and the magnification of reality; but, given no adequate definitions of these terms, we are led to believe that their conception of reality was equivalent. Balzac also claimed as forerunners Molière, Beaumarchais, La Rochefoucauld, Cervantes, Sterne, Diderot, and a host of others. Yet all these realists represented the external world by literary techniques as distinct as their underlying esthetic theories. Leo Spitzer's article, "Le Prétendu Réalisme de Rabelais" (MP, XXXVII [1939-40], 139-50), would have provided useful clues for a comparative analysis. The desire to find the constant Rabelaisian factor in Balzac's entire work (first attempted by Raymond

Massant in his preface to the *Contes drolatiques* in Béguin's edition) obscures Balzac's evolution from youthful optimism and mirthful enjoyment of life to the black corrosive cynicism of his later works. M. Lecuyer's defense is that, on the one hand, pessimism is not present in the *Contes drolatiques* and, on the other, in the *Comédie humaine* "ce pessimisme est moins réel qu'il paraît" (p. 211). In the first statement he is inconsistent with the stated aim of his study (see p. 14) and in the second, he closes his eyes to an essential aspect of Balzac's final and essential vision of social relations. *Le Cousin Pons*, for example, is described as a "symphonie rabelaisienne." But what could be more anti-Rabelaisian than this symphony of pessimism?

M. Lecuyer tries to resolve his dilemma by saying that, while he might have dealt too exclusively with the Rabelaisian aspect of Balzac, he felt justified in neglecting the novelist's mystic and metaphysical tendencies because they figure in relatively few works. But still he cannot safely distort Balzac's psychological development. The disillusioned cynic of maturity sprang from, but was not equivalent to, the joyful Rabelaisian youth.

There are occasional brief comparisons between the renaissance and romanticism, "tous les deux mouvements de libération" (p. 19; Cf. pp. 71, 72, 105, 207). Despite the fact that M. Lecuyer is not trying to show the mere revival of Rabelais' ideas in Balzac's time, he rightfully feels that "leurs œuvres peuvent dans une large mesure se comparer en fonction de leur époque et de leur société" (p. 207). This commonplace could have been further explored to give it substance although, on first glance, the libertarian thrust of the "abbaye de Thélème" resembles more the phalansteries of Fourier than the conservative social system that Balzac defended in *Sur Catherine de Médecis* and other works.

Certain contestable opinions aside, M. Lecuyer's study is a necessary addition to our knowledge of the many components that went into the complex Honoré de Balzac. (STEPHEN GENDZIER, Columbia University)

*L'Aspect métaphysique du mal dans l'œuvre littéraire de Charles Baudelaire et d'Edgar Allan Poe.* Par Arnolds Grava. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1956. Pp. x + 155. The critics who once could see in Baudelaire only a hyper-esthete, a disciple of art for art's sake, would scarcely recognize him with the "new look" that he has acquired during the past thirty years or so. Along with the movement to rehabilitate, legally, the *Fleurs du mal*, there has been another, unorganized but enthusiastically supported, to reveal the author's soul as that of a philosopher, a moralist and even, according to T. S. Eliot, "a Christian born out of his due time."

One of the most remarkable works along these lines was Professor Marcel Ruff's thesis, *L'Esprit du mal et l'esthétique baudelairienne*, which received much well-deserved attention when it appeared two years ago. Now, from another quarter, comes Dr. Grava's thesis, again treating the problem of evil, but including Poe for comparative purposes. Despite their common interest in what is perhaps the basic problem in Baudelaire's life and poetry, Professor Ruff and Dr. Grava do not see eye to eye. This is only natural, for the former's approach is fundamentally that of the literary historian, while the latter's, as his title indicates, is almost entirely metaphysical.

Of the four main chapters in this book the first is devoted to a succinct review of the various explanations that have been put forth for the Poe-Baudelaire affinity. Some of the assertions contained in this section are somewhat lacking in persuasion.

For example, many students of comparative literature would not agree that Poe and Baudelaire belonged to the same literary movement, lived in a common intellectual climate, and underwent the same influences. Nor is it by any means demonstrated that Baudelaire's "obsession" was as strong before Poe's death as it was afterward. But I hasten to add that these minor flaws—even if they are flaws—do not detract from the cogency of Dr. Grava's main argument, which he conducts with considerable skill.

Using the somewhat esoteric terminology of the German theologian, Rudolf Otto, Dr. Grava next turns to an investigation of the "numinous" origin of what he considers the most significant feature of the Poe-Baudelaire affinity, namely, their preoccupation with the macabre. On the esthetic plane he finds them in perfect agreement, both holding that strangeness is a necessary element of all beauty. On the metaphysical plane, however, their dissimilarity is strikingly pronounced: Poe exhibits no interest at all in the moral or emotive aspects of the problem of evil, while for Baudelaire they are paramount.

The third chapter analyzes the ontological foundation and the characteristics of the concepts of evil held by the two authors. By means of well-chosen passages from their works, Dr. Grava brings out the fact that Poe is essentially a monist, for whom God and the human soul are identical; Baudelaire, however, is torn between monism, toward which his intellect directs him, and a form of mystical dualism, toward which he is drawn by his emotions. A portion of this chapter deals with the spirit of revolt in Baudelaire. Contending that the poet refused to accept the dogmatic conception of the Christian God and of the divinity of Jesus, Dr. Grava ridicules Massin's implication that only through his failure to meet the right spiritual adviser was Baudelaire prevented from becoming a perfect Christian.

In his final chapter, Dr. Grava presents a critical evaluation of the two authors, based on the principles of Whiteheadian organic philosophy. He concludes that, while Baudelaire came much nearer than Poe did to a solution of the problem of good and evil, he also failed, by succumbing to what Whitehead calls "the fallacy of misplaced concreteness," i.e., in not realizing that "evil is necessarily in Creativity, but not in God, since the latter, not being absolute, did not create the universe *ex nihilo*."

Compared with some of the psychoanalytical, existentialist, and mystical attempts to delve into the "real" Baudelaire, this little study is refreshingly original and lucid. With its clever synthesis of Rudolf Otto, Paul Arnold and Whitehead, it escapes doctrinaire heaviness and rigidity. What is more, it strikes to the center of the least explored aspect of the Poe-Baudelaire affinity and is easily the most penetrating study of the subject yet to appear.

One hesitates to criticize the peripheral documentation of a study when its author has clearly defined the limits of his aim and method. However, in view of the claim in his Introduction that no one had previously treated the philosophical and metaphysical implication of Baudelaire's literary production, it becomes necessary to point out that he has overlooked or ignored some very important works, such as Georges Blin's *Baudelaire* (Paris: Gallimard, 1939) and Benjamin Fondane's *Baudelaire et l'expérience du gouffre* (Paris: Seghers, 1947). In a bibliography of secondary sources which descends to such paltry titles as Joseph D. Bennett's *Baudelaire*, the works referred to might well be given a place of honor.

The volume contains relatively few typographical errors, for a book in French printed on American presses, but there is one in the quotation from Marie Bona-

parte which might be misleading: "instructif" for "instinctif" (p. 113). One rather hopes that the statement that some of Baudelaire's *Poèmes en prose* were written, or published, before 1847 might be due to a printing mishap, although that hardly seems likely. Finally, Dr. Grava's excessive faith in his secondary sources sometimes gets him into trouble. Failure to detect a typographical slip in Lemonnier's *Traducteurs d'Edgar Poe* causes him to list the translation in *La Quotidienne* ahead of several others which actually antedate it. Similarly, in quoting from Cambiaire's notoriously inaccurate work, Dr. Grava fails to notice and correct the reference to Laforgue, whom Cambiaire cites as "Jules Forgues." (W. T. BANDY, *University of Wisconsin*)

*La Lanterne magique.* Par Robert Poulet. Paris: Nouvelles Editions Debresse, 1956. Pp. 262. This collection of reviews and essays on contemporary French writing is anything but dull or ordinary. M. Poulet is a critic of insight and originality and of immense, if sometimes questionable, enthusiasm. The emotional tone of this book weakens but does not destroy the conservatism of Poulet's thought; and it is indeed a pleasure to discover a good modern critic who can appreciate art for its own sake and avoid the compulsion to seek out Freud, God, or Satan in every other line. Poulet's taste runs to writers who can communicate directly without either sinking to the obvious or grasping for the obscure. Their salvation, to him, comes from a respect for (if not a reliance on) the classical tradition and the clarity and conciseness it implies.

Unfortunately, however, he sometimes indulges, unclassically, in inconsistency and emotional judgment. Here he shares the same weakness as Proust when he attacked the method of Sainte-Beuve. Like Proust, he would separate the *moi banal*, the social-political man, from the inner, creative life of the artist. Yet he sometimes lapses into the very attitudes he wants to reject. Thus, although he admires Claudel's poetry, Poulet insists on a paradox (and one that has little to do with art!) between Claudel the Christian poet and "le personnage mesquin, borné et haineux qui [...] s'acharna contre Maurras vaincu" (p. 41). One would agree with him and Proust that an author's social and political setting should not be the critic's concern, but the Maurras reference and the further statement that Claudel was a "diplomate vaniteux et gaffeur" hardly strengthen this argument.

If Poulet's politics betray him, his literary conservatism does not, and he is always conscious of France's debt to the past and of the classical influences on contemporary literature. Thus he regrets that much of modern poetry (Eluard, Saint-John Perse) has lost the clarity of communication and become lost in its own private idiom. And he observes that as society becomes less stratified art tends either to compromise with the public or to react violently against it. He views literature as a "moyen de connaissance," and he thinks it fares better from restraint than profusion: "Ce qu'il faut savoir d'un personnage et d'un milieu tient, au fond, en quelques lignes; le reste—dans Balzac, dans Dostoïevski, comme dans Proust—n'est qu'un jeu qui consiste à rebrouiller ce que l'intuition a débrouillé" (p. 63). Hence he admires the novels of a Giono or the criticism of a Paulhan who, though a thinker and philosopher, can avoid the metaphysical jargon of the "peineurs professionnels."

This same classic awareness of clarity and the *visage nu* leads him to regret in Montherlant the wavering between the lyric and anti-lyric, the Catholic and agnostic. The morbidity and *invraisemblance* in the novels of a Mauriac or a Simone de

Beauvoir seem to him less understandable than the characters of a Julien Green or a Céline who have no religious or "existential" pretensions. And since Poulet respects the classical inheritance, he prefers to the constant *remise en question* of Camus, with its repudiation of the "secrets irremplacables" of the past, the writers "qui ont su illuminer par le dedans les lignes fuyantes de la fable" (p. 137).

Poulet's enthusiasm leads to a rash of superlatives that dulls the otherwise mature thought of these essays. We may or may not agree that Rebaret's *Les Deux Etendards* is the only novel of our times to compare with *L'Education sentimentale*; that Giono is "le premier romancier français de ce temps" (p. 93); or that Simenon is "le plus grand romancier de la terre" (p. 107); but we have a right to expect more evidence for such judgments.

In spite of all this, however, Poulet succeeds in presenting his case: the preference for writers and critics who look beyond the pale of *le moi banal*; and his belief that the classical manner can best preserve clarity and communication in art. And at a time when obscurity is often confused with "significance" he is not afraid to chide Beckett and his *Godot*: "La solution consiste à justifier la divagation surréaliste en la coulant dans un certain nombre de conventions, de rites et de rythmes bien connus: ceux des clowns" (p. 240). (JAMES C. McLAREN, *Chatham College*)

*L'Influence de Ruskin sur la vie, les idées et l'œuvre de Marcel Proust*. Par Jean Autret. Genève: Droz; Lille: Giard, 1955. Pp. 179. This University of Chicago thesis, written under the supervision of Professor Robert Vigneron, approaches in a spirit of exact science a subject which is essentially esthetic. With innumerable articles on the subject and one thesis (Sybil de Souza's *L'Influence de Ruskin sur Proust*) already in existence, there was undoubtedly no other way to rejuvenate the material for doctoral purposes, and one is tempted simultaneously to deplore and to commend the aridity which results. The Souza thesis was conceived in a different spirit and, despite its defects (many proper names misspelled, for example), it is perhaps more suitable for a casual introduction to the subject. It is out of print and virtually inaccessible, however, so that, by default if for no other reason, the Autret thesis now becomes the best place in which to document oneself.

Except to cite his predecessors in his bibliography, M. Autret makes a complete *tabula rasa* of them, but, on the other hand, he never overtly claims having made any discoveries. As a result, he does both his predecessors and himself some injustice. The fortunes of Ruskin in France, the sequence of Proust's Ruskinian articles and translations, the accuracy of these translations, and finally Proust's early appraisal and partial rejection of Ruskin have already been treated in considerable detail. M. Autret has now added to the detail by publishing long paraphrases of Proust's articles and by listing in parallel columns, covering many pages, excerpts from Proust's articles compared with his sources and from Proust's translations compared with Ruskin's English. M. Autret has not discovered the sources because they are articles on Ruskin already mentioned by Mlle de Souza; he has merely added factual proof of Proust's increasing familiarity with Ruskin and the English language and of his growing independence with respect to his sources and, subsequently, with respect to Ruskin himself. All of this has been done so meticulously that it will certainly never have to be done again.

In this mass of detail in the first two chapters few general ideas emerge. With no introduction, the reader literally plunges into the subject and does not come to the surface again until the third chapter, "L'Influence directe de Ruskin sur Proust."

This builds into something more readable but hardly more significant to anyone familiar with Proustiana because M. Autret is really unable to arrive at any general conclusions which his predecessors had not already reached. Here again, however, the value of his *tabula rasa* is apparent because he singles out a considerable number of passages in Ruskin, not hitherto mentioned, which are definite sources for the text of *A la Recherche du temps perdu*. If the conclusions are not new, the evidence, to a large extent, is.

The author reserves his two real discoveries for the fourth chapter, "La Peinture dans *Swann*." In the first place, he proves not only that Proust, in his references to Botticelli and to Giotto, was leaning very heavily on Ruskin, whom he had long before renounced, but that the connection between Odette and Botticelli is not just metamorphical, since the physical description of the character closely parallels Ruskin's description of Botticelli's Zipporah. Proust must have opened again the illustrated Library Edition of Ruskin's works which he owned. This proves beyond a reasonable doubt that the real Odette was Zipporah and not any person in real life. M. Autret's second discovery has to do with Elstir whom all previous commentators, including Maurice E. Chernowitz in his *Proust and Painting*, had identified with the impressionists. M. Autret is convinced, with documents, illustrations and Ruskin in support, that Elstir is Turner with a sprinkling of Carpaccio. However convincingly presented the evidence may be, this is too startling a conclusion to be passed over lightly. One would say, rather, that Proust, reminded of certain impressionist-like remarks of Ruskin about these painters, recreated their paintings in his imagination to conform to the techniques of the modern impressionists about whom, elsewhere, he has so much to say.

M. Autret's last chapter, "L'Art religieux dans *Swann*," is almost extraneous to his thesis since it deals, not with Ruskin but with Emile Mâle and related subjects. Proust, as Mlle de Souza had pointed out, read Mâle and Viollet-le-Duc as a corrective to Ruskin. M. Autret has done a very useful service in running down the originals of Proust's references to religious art. Here his information seems entirely original and very illuminating, if not so revolutionary as his conclusions about Elstir. But this last chapter is another thesis and detracts even more from the unity of his book which must be treated as a source book since it cannot be read with any pleasure as a literary essay. As a source book, it is indispensable for any university library. (DOUGLAS W. ALDEN, Princeton University)

*Proust*. By J. M. Cocking. London: Bowes & Bowes, 1956. Pp. 80. After Martin Turnell on Rivière, Enid Starkie on Gide and Elizabeth Sewell on Valéry, the compact *Studies in Modern European Literature and Thought* present a superb introduction to Proust by Professor J. M. Cocking of King's College, University of London. The printer's achievement in packing 40,000 words into 72 pages is only surpassed by the skill with which the author says so much in so few words. Indeed, he tells us all we need to know of Proust to enjoy his work, with but rare excursions into details of limited interest (Proust's fusion of nineteenth-century Idealism and Positivism, pp. 36-37; a comparison between Swann and Emma Bovary, pp. 57-58; the inadequacies of Scott Moncrieff's translation, pp. 74-75).

On the plan of *A la recherche*, Proust's esthetics, the conflict between his (and Marcel's) social ambitions and literary vocation, the construction of characters, and the complex, often confused reasoning of *Le Temps retrouvé* Mr. Cocking is a penetrating and illuminating critic. And he has written the first serious study to make adequate use of the posthumous works, *Jean Santeuil* and *Contre Sainte-*

*Beuve*, to throw new light on the mature masterpiece. "What *Jean Santeuil* lacks, and *A la recherche* has," he states on p. 15, "is the construction of experience into a philosophical drama, with involuntary memory as the *deus ex machina*. Everything which Proust says about memory in *A la recherche* is explicit or implicit in *Jean Santeuil*; but not surrounded with the mystery of sleep and the unconscious, preceded by presentiments, struggling free of enchantments, suddenly appearing with a preternatural vividness of sensation to raise a past self from the dead."

The role of intelligence in Proust, the repeated conflict between imagination and reality, and the distribution of Proust's temperament and experience among various fictional characters are some of the points that have never before been so satisfactorily treated. Even though this study will have richer implications for one who has just read *A la recherche*, surely there is no better introduction to Proust nor one that could more confidently be put into the hands of advanced students. One unfortunate misprint (p. 69) should be corrected: "Swann's love for Odette and Charles's for Marcel" ought of course to read "for Morel." (JUSTIN O'BRIEN, *Columbia University*)

*L'Ontologie de Miguel de Unamuno*. Par François Meyer. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1955. Pp. 133. Esta *Ontología* de Unamuno es seguramente el más sólido estudio filosófico que sobre él hasta ahora se ha escrito. El pensador español aparece en ella como algo más que un vago precursor de los existencialistas. Las perspectivas que él abre, afirma F. Meyer, son no sólo diferentes sino también "no menos significativas que las de los representantes habituales del existencialismo" (p. 16). La relación con éstos—de Kierkegaard a Sartre—es precisada, aunque sea brevemente, de un modo más firme y hondo de lo que se ha venido haciendo. Se trata en la obra, ante todo, de mostrar la estrecha conexión que hay entre los diversos temas de Unamuno, la íntima coherencia de su pensamiento, oculta bajo el desorden de la exposición y su conocida falta de rigor y método.

"Las formas múltiples del *tragicismo unamuniano*," dice el autor, tienen su origen en una "experiencia ontológica primera." Es un ansia de infinito, brotada de la conciencia de la propia finitud; un *querer serlo todo*, y, a la vez, un no querer dejar de ser uno mismo, no perder conciencia de sí, no querer dejar de *serse*, como Unamuno decía. Es "lo imposible y contradictorio [...] lo finito-infinito," y con ello Unamuno se acerca—aunque la cuestión se enfoque desde ángulos muy distintos—a la concepción del fenómeno, del sujeto, en *L'Être et le néant* de Sartre. Es una pasión de todo que surge "como tensión del ser para escapar a la nada." Y esa *nada* no la introduce Unamuno caprichosamente: es una dimensión del ser concreto, que se le revela a él en la conciencia de sí, en el *serse*. La básica "intuición central" es, pues—y esto es lo importante—algo más que la mera "proyección de un temperamento"; es una evidencia, una experiencia fundada en la percepción aguda de "las condiciones mismas del ser concreto," una especie de "experiencia pura de lo trágico del ser."

De ese "nudo dialéctico del *serse* y del *serlo todo*," se deriva el dualismo de otros diversos temas de Unamuno: historia e intrahistoria, exterioridad e interioridad, "novela" y "fondo de la persona," etc. Y es que así como el *querer serlo todo*, en la experiencia ontológica, es inseparable del *serse*, la intrahistoria es también inseparable de la historia, o el "fondo de la persona" de la "novela" que es cada vida. Lo *noumenal*, dice F. Meyer, glosando a Unamuno—que usa lenguaje kantiano—no existe sino "en conflicto dialéctico con lo fenomenal, lo espacial, temporal y finito." Renunciar a lo absoluto, al todo, sería imposible; pero "abandonarse (si ello fuera

posible) al todo, a lo inconsciente y a lo intrahistórico, sería aceptar la disolución y la nada" (p. 52). Y éste es el eterno conflicto.

Toda la antropología unamuniana se deriva igualmente de la "situación ontológica del ser concreto existente," y a menudo se confunde con ella. Y así el ansia de inmortalidad es sólo "manifestación particular de una pasión más esencial [...] el querer serlo todo."

No sorprende leer que la razón y la fe se oponen en "una unión antitética y polémica," aunque aquí no sea quizás fácil hacer que coincidan "razón" y "fe" con los polos *sers e serlo todo* del conflicto ontológico. Mas no hay, tal vez, que aspirar siempre a una superposición de polos, sino a observar que, en esencia, el conflicto es siempre el mismo. Las páginas dedicadas a este conflicto son iluminadoras. Unamuno no era tan antirracionalista como parecía. Se oponía al absolutismo de la razón, pero nunca cae en puro fideísmo. Hay una "dependencia necesaria de la fe con respecto a la razón," que él reconocía. Fe y razón luchan, desesperadamente, y de esa lucha, en el fondo del abismo, con la angustia, se le revelaba a Unamuno, escribe F. Meyer, "el misterio del ser." Se le revelaba de nuevo, agregariamos, ya que esa revelación era lo propio de la experiencia primera. Pero Unamuno dice, en esa y otras ocasiones—recordando a Kierkegaard y recordando su propia crisis religiosa de 1897—que, con la angustia, se le revelaba la fe, que conquistaba la fe. No creemos, por tanto, que pueda afirmarse que "jamás Unamuno creerá posible trascender la razón, dar como Kierkegaard el salto." Lo creía posible, dió él mismo ese salto, una vez al menos, en 1897; pero sin duda aludió a él muchas más veces que lo dió. Se quedaba en el conflicto, exacerbado, las más de las veces, y por eso F. Meyer tiene razón al afirmar que, en el fondo del abismo, se le revelaba "el misterio del ser," el ansia de Dios, otra vez, y no Dios mismo. Y tal vez a menudo no se le revelaba nada, sino que simplemente aludía al conflicto ontológico, recordándolo.

No se trata en esta obra del problema del histriónismo. Unamuno se refirió a ello, confesándose; aunque solía hacerlo, como ocurre em *Cómo se hace una novela*, relacionado este problema con el más hondo "problema de la personalidad," con el de la "novela" y el "fondo de la persona," con el de ser y representarse. Y así se justificaba ya que, venía a decir, *representarse* es fatal, puesto que el fondo está ligado a la apariencia. Mas el caso es que él se "representó," hizo el papel de Unamuno, mucho más de la cuenta. Y lo sabía. De ello, repetimos, no se ocupa el autor de esta obra, aunque sí, y brillantemente, del tema de la "novela," del problema del "ente de ficción."

Todos los temas unamunianos de que se ocupa, aunque sea con brevedad, quedan magníficamente iluminados, enriquecidos. Y por ello nos parece que aun quien no acepte la tesis central, ha de encontrar esta obra sumamente valiosa. Algunos dirán que en esta *Ontología* aparece Unamuno cambiado, mucho más articulado y lógico, más francés de lo que era. Pero lo cierto es que François Meyer no desvirtúa jamás lo que es esencial en Unamuno, su "tragicismo"; que éste aparece bien sentido, comprendido y esclarecido, y que con ello no se pierde nada de Unamuno, ni Unamuno pierde nada, y posiblemente gana mucho. Y gana desde luego el lector. Con benevolencia para los defectos de Unamuno—su "delirio verbal"—y con gran respeto a la riqueza y bondad de sus intuiciones, el libro de Meyer, un penetrante análisis, es un verdadero homenaje; homenaje escrito por persona llena de sensibilidad y en extremo bien documentada y capacitada. (A. SÁNCHEZ BARBUDO, *University of Wisconsin*)

# **Le Style des *Pléiades* de Gobineau**

**BY MICHAEL RIFFATERRE**

Using a new approach to literary criticism, the author shows how both Gobineau's philosophy of life and subconscious thoughts are expressed through his style in *Les Pléiades*. A method of stylistic analysis, free of the old rhetorical subdivisions, gives Professor Riffaterre unusual insight into Gobineau's work and supports his conclusion that Gobineau's enduring value lies not in his unfortunate sociological theories but in his originality as a writer. *In French.*

\$4.50



**COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS  
NEW YORK 27, N. Y.**

